

THE  
CRITICAL REVIEW.

---

SERIES THE THIRD.

---

Vol. III.

SEPTEMBER, 1804.

No. I.

---

ART. I.—*Taylor's Plato.* (Continued from p. 289 of our preceding Volume.)

THE specimens which we gave in our last number, may suffice to convey an idea of the general style of the translation before us. Every competent and impartial judge will, we conceive, allow that it bears little resemblance to the dignified original, and will confess (to adopt a metaphor used by Mr. Taylor) that 'the deep and majestic river of eloquence,' so conspicuous in Plato's writings, if not 'branched out into a number of smaller rivulets,' is rendered in its new channel both hoarse and turbid. But this is not all: we have a much greater fault to urge against the performance. It is not only void of dignity and elegance; it is void of correctness also. This opinion indeed we have already expressed: we have done more: we have in some measure proved it. But we are desirous of placing our assertion beyond the reach of cavil; we wish to support the charge by such a body of evidence, as shall leave no room for the translator's warmest admirers and most zealous patrons (if such he have) to say that he has been unfairly treated. It is this which induces us to speak more fully than usual of the gross errors with which the translation abounds—errors which it would have been impossible not to censure in any one who had ventured to appear before the public as a man of learning; but, in a person who arrogates almost exclusively to himself that title, and is impudent enough to pronounce himself the ONLY man who has read Plato with a view to understand him, are flagitious and unpardonable; it becomes necessary to hold up such vanity and self-conceit to the view and derision of all men.

CRIT. REV. Vol. 3. September, 1804.

B

In instancing Mr. Taylor's want of fidelity, we shall chiefly confine ourselves to the dialogues Euthyphro and Protagoras. In the very commencement of the former, within forty lines from the beginning, we have a meaning affixed to a word which it never bears. We defy Mr. Taylor to produce a passage in which πολιτικός means a *citizen*. Yet, where Socrates is introduced as mentioning to Euthyphro the accusation which Melitus had brought against him as a corrupter of the youth, and as saying, φαίνεται μοι τῶν πολιτικῶν μόνος ἀρχεῖν ὁρθῶς, Mr. Taylor applies this meaning to the word, and translates the passage, 'He only of the *citizens* seems to me to have begun rightly;' instead of which, he ought to have translated it, 'He appears to me to be the only *politician* who has begun in the right place.' The translator, indeed, has committed many similar mistakes. In the Republic, for instance, we remember that ὁμοῦτος, instead of being translated '*one of the same tribe*,' is translated *one of the same country*; and in the Apology of Socrates, Crito is represented by Mr. Taylor as being of the '*same age and city*;' while Plato speaks of him as being of the same age and tribe (ὁμοῦτος); So, again, οὐδεὶς χρηματιστῆς is rendered '*one born to a lucrative employment*;' but it means *one by nature disposed to amass wealth*. In the word παῖς Mr. Taylor has in like manner given a rendering which we believe it would be difficult to support. He understands it to mean a '*foot soldier*.' Thucydides, who generally uses ἵππης for a *horse-man*, would in all probability have used παῖς in the abovementioned sense, had the genius of his language admitted it. But this he never does. Mr. Taylor might have avoided these mistakes by consulting any common lexicon. We have not forgotten that Dr. Watts recommended us to learn languages without the aid of grammars; and perhaps our translator, improving on this plan, has, in his rage against verbal criticism, endeavoured to learn a language without a knowledge of the words that compose it. Yet Mr. Taylor, *proh pudor*! is the editor of a Greek lexicon.

In the following passage Mr. Taylor seems to have been led into an error by confounding ἀρα, which sometimes means *forte*, or *quamobrem*, at others *utique*, *nimirum*, with ἀρα *utrum*. The consequence is, that he has made a sentence *interrogative*, which ought, as the context shows, to have been *affirmative*. Socrates is represented as addressing Euthyphro in the following manner—'Is this then the thing, Euthyphro, on account of which I am brought to the bar, because, when any one asserts things of this kind concerning the gods, I admit them with pain; and



through which some one, as it seems, calls me an offender \* ?'

We say the context proves beyond a doubt that it ought to be affirmative. The opening of the dialogue shows Euthyphro to have been ignorant not only of *the cause*, for which Socrates was accused, but ignorant also that he was *accused at all*. Τί νῦν ἄλλο, ὦ Σώκρατες, γέγονεν, ὅτι σὺ τὰς ἐν Λυκείῳ καταλιπὼν διατριβὰς, ἐνθάδε νῦν διατρίβεις περὶ τὴν τῷ βασιλείῳ στοάν; ἢ γὰρ περὶ καὶ σοὶ δίκη τις ἔσται τυγχάνει πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα, ὥσπερ ἐμὸν. ΣΩ. οὐτοὶ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι γε, ὦ Εὐθύφρων, δίκην αὐτὴν καλοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ γραφὴν. ΕΥ. Τί φῆς; γραφὴν σε τίς, ὡς ἔειπε, γέγραπται; ἢ γὰρ περὶ ἐκείνῳ γε καταγνώσσομαι, ὡς σὺ γε ἕτερον. Now the absurdity of supposing Socrates to ask *this man* what was the cause of his (Socrates) being accused, is glaring indeed. The words \* Ἀρα γε, ὦ Εὐθύφρων, τῷτ' ἐστὶν ἢ ἕνεκα τὴν γραφὴν φέγγω †, mean, most unquestionably, '*Truly, Euthyphro, this is the very thing on account of which I am accused.*' This observation was drawn from Socrates by the remark of Euthyphro, who had said that all men acknowledged Jupiter to be the best and most righteous of gods, and yet confessed that he put his father in chains. To which the philosopher replied, 'On this very account am I accused, because, when men make such assertions, I receive them with great indignation.' Stephanus has improperly printed *ἀρα*: but, as he makes the sentence affirmative, it was probably an error of the press. Forster's edition of this dialogue has *ἄρα*, correctly. We think it not improbable that Mr. Taylor was deceived by the old version of Ficinus, from which he sometimes appears to have translated, rather than from the original. We are induced to think so, since, without some such supposition, we are unable to account for errors of a similar nature with the following.

\* Soc. Hence the same things will be holy and unholy, O Euthyphro, from this reasoning.

\* Euth. It seems so.

\* Soc. You have not, therefore, O wonderful man, answered my question; for I did not ask you this, *to whom* the same thing is holy and unholy, &c.' Vol. v. p. 13.

Ficinus has '*Non ergo quod quærebam, vir egregie, respondisti. Non enim id volebam cui ut et sanctum et profanum sit, contigit.*' The original is 'Οὐκ ἄρα, ὃ ἡρώμην, ἀπεκρίνω, ὦ θαυμάσιε· οὐ γὰρ τοῦτο γε ἡρώτων· Ὁ (not ὦ) τυγχάνει ταυτὸν ὃν ὁσίον τε καὶ ἀνόσιον. Upon which of the two Mr. Taylor had his eyes, let any man judge. The expression *cui*, which might refer either to *rei* or *homini*, was ambiguous; and the translator, in his haste, had forgotten to look at Plato. So also, in the

\* Page 10, vol. v.

† Tom. i. p. 6. A. ed. Steph.

Phædo, the Latin translator has been the innocent cause of a mistake, by rendering *μηκύνω τὸν μῦθον\**, *produxi fabulam*, which Mr. Taylor (neglecting, as we suppose, to have recourse to the Greek itself) has turned into *produced* the fable.

In the space of a few pages we meet with a further proof, either that the translator did not understand his author, or that he has taken a most unwarrantable liberty with the text.—‘*Is not this therefore the case with that which is beloved, or making, or suffering something from some one†?*’ This is intended to convey the sense of the words *οὐκ οὖν καὶ τὸ φιλούμενον, ἢ γιγνόμενόν τι ἐστὶν ἢ πάσχον τι ὑπὸ τοῦ;* They mean, however, no such thing. The manner in which *τι ἐστὶν* is introduced, shows this in the clearest manner to any one skilled in the language. Had Mr. Taylor followed Ficinus in this place, he would have approached more nearly to his author’s meaning. ‘*Nonne et id quod amatur, aut quod fit est aut quod ab aliquo quid patitur,*’ expresses the force of the words with tolerable accuracy. This is also obvious from what immediately precedes, where Plato says, *εἴ τι γίγνεται, ἢ εἴ τι πάσχει, τί, οὐκ ὅτι γιγνόμενόν ἐστι γίγνεται, ἀλλ’ ὅτι γίγνεται γιγνόμενον ἐστίν.* He wishes to reduce the *τὸ φιλούμενον* to the same rules; and therefore asks if it does not come under the description of the *γιγνόμενον* or *πάσχον*. And the subsequent words, *καὶ τοῦτο (id est τὸ φιλούμενον) ἄρα οὕτως ἔχει ὥσπερ τὰ πρότερα*, are an additional proof of it. Had the author wished to convey the sense ascribed to him by the translator, he would have used some such expression as *οὐκ οὕτως ἔχει καὶ κατὰ τὸ φιλούμενον, ἢ γιγνόμενον, ἢ πάσχον τι ὑπὸ τοῦ.*

The subsequent page furnishes us with an additional reason to believe that Mr. Taylor has a very inferior knowledge of the language from which he has so often undertaken to translate. He gives us, ‘For whatever position we adopt is some how or other *circumvented*, and is not willing to remain where we established it,’ as the sense of *περιέρχεται γὰρ πως αἰὲν ἡμῖν ὃ ἂν ὑποθώμεθα, καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλει μένειν ὅπερ ἂν ἰδρυσώμεθα αὐτό.* We must beg leave to inform him that *περιέρχομαι* does not mean to be circumvented, but to go about, to go around, to change its situation. It is not, as Mr. Taylor erroneously supposes, a verb *passive*, but, as grammarians call it, a verb *deponent*. The sense of the words is placed beyond all doubt by the reply which Socrates makes to this complaint—*Τὴ ἡμετέρα προγοῦν εἰκεν εἶναι Δαίδαλῳ τὰ ὑπο σὺ λεγόμενα*—alluding to the images of Dædalus, which were supposed to have been endued with a *loco-motive* power. So again in the very next page, from a want of attention to the nature of the answer made by Socrates, Mr. Taylor has destroyed all the spirit and force of the passage.

\* Page 304. ed. Forst.

† Page 17. Vol. v.

'I do not comprehend what you say,' (ἐκ ἔπομαι τοῖς λεγομένοις) observes Euthyphro: 'And yet you are younger than I,' remarks Socrates. Now we contend that a mere English reader cannot possibly see the propriety of the answer. He never can understand what connexion there is between youth and intellect; nor will he perceive that a man of twenty-six ought to have a more quick perception than one of forty. But when he learns that ἔπομαι means to follow, and is told that Euthyphro's complaint is equivalent with 'I cannot follow your observations, or I cannot keep pace with what is said,' the neatness and the wittiness of the reply appear to him at once. We object also to the translation of καὶ γὰρ νῦν, ἐπειδὴ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἦσθα, ἀπετράπη given by Mr. Taylor. The force of the words is not adequately conveyed by—'For, when you drew near for this purpose, you receded.' They would have been more properly represented by—'For, when you were come to the very point, you flew off.'

So much for the Euthyphro, from which we turn to the Protagoras. This dialogue has, in our estimation, as great merit as any one that has assumed an English garb under the auspices of Mr. Taylor. But even in this we meet with some extraordinary mistakes—mistakes which certainly would have excited in us great surprise, had we been less accustomed to find them in the present work. We beg leave, for instance, to ask the translator where he discovered that ἄτοπον μέντοι τί σοι ἐθέλω εἰπεῖν· παρόντος γὰρ ἐκείνου ὅτε προσεῖχον τὸν νῦν, ἐπελανθανόμεν τὲ αὐτῷ θαμά\* signified, 'However, I wish to tell you something strange; though he was present I did not attend to him, and even forgot to look at him?' We can assure him, that, until his days, ἐπελανθανόμεν τὲ αὐτῷ θαμά signified, *I even frequently forgot he was there.* What could have been passing in his brain when he made this mistake, we leave others to determine. To us it appears that a confused idea of the word θαμά was the cause of this ridiculous error; although every one knows that ἐπελανθανόμεν τὲ αὐτῷ θαμά is barbarous and inexplicable. We further crave permission to inquire how he learned that ἐπειδὴν δὲ ταχισταί με ἐκ τῆ κόπης ὁ ὕπνος ἀνῆκεν, εὐθὺς ἀναστὰς ὅτῳ θεῶν ἐπορευόμεν† was of the same import with 'but soon falling asleep from weariness, when I awoke I came hither‡?' Let him ask a mere school-boy, and he will be told that it means, 'but the moment I awoke from the sleep into which I had been thrown by fatigue, I started up and came hither.' Surely the translator of Plotinus, Pausanias, Orpheus, Plato, and we know not how many others, should not have mistaken so obvious a phrase. Surely such a man ought to know also

\* Tom. i. p. 309. B. ed. Steph.

† Tom. i. p. 310. D. ed. Steph.

‡ Vol. v. p. 105.

that it is a most unwarrantable liberty to make an author unequivocally assert a thing when he only expresses a surmise—*καὶ οὐκ ἂν θαυμάζοιμι* (says Plato, p. 315, E.) *εἰ παιδικὰ τῷ Πausanias τυγχάνει ἂν*. 'I should not wonder if he were a favourite of Pausanias,' says the translation. Mr. Taylor may look upon such remarks with contempt, and dismiss them with the reply of mere verbal criticism. It is true, we confess, that they are so. It is also equally true, that to confound *ἐκ ἂν θαυμάζοιμι* *εἰ* with *ἐκ ἐθαύμασα* *ὅτι*, does not bespeak the scholar who is equal to the task of translating Plato; and indeed the inaccuracy into which Mr. Taylor has been betrayed by his deficiency in that species of criticism, is no mean proof of its value and necessity.

Were we disposed to be captious, we might object to a passage which occurs in the next page\*, and say that 'I direct my attention to many other things besides this,' is not the true sense of *καὶ ἄλλας πρὸς ταύτην* [sc. *ἐνλαΐειαν*] *ἔσκεμμαι*. But we cannot avoid considering the manner in which he has rendered the following words, as a mark of extreme inattention: 'Ὅσα γὰρ ἴγουνται ἀλλήλους κακὰ ἔχειν ἀνθρώποι φύσει ἢ τύχῃ, εἰδὲς θυμῶται†.' 'No one is enraged with another on account of those evils which he thinks arise from nature or ART‡.' That this proceeded from carelessness, is evident; for the words occur a few lines afterwards, where they are properly translated nature or fortune. Had Mr. Taylor taken the trouble to read a second time what he had written, he would have seen that the reasoning was utterly destroyed by him. A careful re-perusal of his work would have saved him also from a similar mistake which occurs at page 128 of the same volume, where *ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ ἐλαιον τοῖς μὲν φυτοῖς ἅπασιν ἐστὶ πάγκαλον, καὶ τοῖς θρίξι πολεμιώτατον ταῖς τῶν ἄλλων ζώων πλήν ταῖς τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ* is made to signify—'Thus, too, oil is a very EXCELLENT thing for all plants; but is most hostile to the hairs of all animals except man.'—So completely does the work under consideration fail as to the character which Mr. Taylor would affix to it; and so entirely, in numberless cases, does it not only 'lose a word of the original,' but even destroy its meaning.

In our last number we produced an instance of ungrammatical construction: the present dialogue furnishes another. 'But the boy most happily born for that art, would be found to be *him* who made the greatest proficiency§.' We do not approve, moreover, of the expression 'most happily born:' the force of *ευφρέστατος* would have been better expressed by 'one who is born with a genius best suited,' &c. The charge which we have now brought against Mr. Taylor may appear to many to

\* Vol. v. p. 111.

† Page 323. C.

‡ Vol. v. p. 118.

§ Page 121.

have been sufficiently supported by the evidence already produced: but, as we before said, we are determined to put it beyond the reach of cavil; and we proceed, in consequence, to the remainder of the dialogue.

Καὶ γὰρ εἰ μὲν τις περὶ αὐτῶν τούτων συγγένοιτο ὁπωσὺν τῶν δημηγόρων, τάχ' ἂν καὶ τοιοῦτος λόγος ἀκούσταιεν ἢ Περικλῆς, ἢ ἄλλου τινος τῶν ἱκανῶν εἰπεῖν\*, we had always understood to mean—'and, indeed, were a man to converse with any of our public orators, such as Pericles, or any other who is distinguished for his eloquence, he would hear the same sort of arguments upon these very topics.' Not so Mr. Taylor: he has found out that they mean—'For, if some one should discourse with some one of the popular orators, perhaps he would hear arguments of this kind, such as Pericles delivered, or some other eloquent man†.' Serranus, we observe, has committed the very same mistake; but he is rightly corrected by Stephanus.

Mr. Taylor, as we have frequently remarked, declares it to have been his endeavour 'not to lose a word of the original;' but in the following passage, which occurs at page 331, C., his endeavour has not been crowned with any great success—*ἔδεν γὰρ δεῖσθαι τὸ εἰ βῆλει τοῦτο, καὶ εἰ σοι δοκεῖ ἐλέγχεσθαι· ἀλλ' ἐμὲ τε καὶ σε. τὸ δ' ἐμὲ τε καὶ σε τοῦτο λέγω, οἰόμενος οὕτως τὸν λόγον βέλτιστ' ἂν ἐλέγχεσθαι, εἴ τις τὸ εἰ ἀξέλοι αὐτοῦ.* This is translated—'I have nothing to do with, said I, with I will; and if it is agreeable to you, let it be reprobated. And let us also be persuaded that the subject of our conversation will be discussed in the best manner, when the particle if is removed from it‡.' Now, in the first place, there is not a word in the original which corresponds with *if it is agreeable to you, let it be reprobated*. Εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, ἐλέγχεσθαι, which the translator supposed to mean so, implies a very different thing. Τὸ δ' ἐμὲ τε καὶ σε, we conceive, he could make nothing of: he therefore omitted it entirely; and as to οἰόμενος, that he has turned into οἰόμενοι. So much for his fidelity! But if he will condescend to listen to us who have not lost in the mists of Platonism what little sense we had, he may learn that the paragraph above quoted signifies, 'I do not wish to argue with you *if you will*, and *if you please*, I wish the argument to be between you and ME.—I say between you and me, because I conceive that the subject will be best discussed when *if* is discarded from it.' Had any man but Mr. Taylor committed such a mistake—'quantos egisset triumphos!' Poor verbalists would have thought themselves happy in escaping with the loss of their ears, had they suffered such a blunder to have disgraced their page. But,

"Solet a despectis par referri gratia;"

\* Tom. i. p. 328. E. † Vol. v. p. 123. ‡ Vol. v. p. 125.



and, as Mr. Taylor has declared that no man but himself has read Plato '*with a view* to understand him,' we shall, without ceremony, say that Mr. Taylor has read Plato *without ability* to understand him.

We have had occasion to notice the *happy* talent of this gentleman for conjectural criticism: he seems to have indulged them to some extent in the following paragraph; but, from his total silence, it is only by comparing his translation with the original author, that we can discover what he has done in that line.

'For one thing always resembles another in a certain respect, *contraries alone excepted*; for white has no similitude to black, nor hard to soft; and so with respect to other things which appear to be most contrary to each other, and which, as we before observed, possess another power, and of which one does not resemble the other. *But there are other things*, such as the parts of the face, in which the one is similar to the other. *So that, although you should confute these things after this manner*, if you are of opinion that *all are similar to each other*; yet it is not just to call those things similar which possess a certain similitude to each other, as neither is it just to call those things which possess a certain dissimilitude dissimilar, though they have but very little of the similar.' Vol. v. P. 125.

In our lives we do not remember to have seen many passages in which so much impertinent liberty has been taken with the text, and so many gross blunders have been committed. Plato's words are—Καὶ γὰρ ὅτι οὐδὲν ὁμοῦν ἀμυγέπη προσέεικε. τὸ γὰρ λευκὸν τῷ μέλανι ἔστιν ὁ μὴ προσέεικε, καὶ τὸ σκληρὸν τῷ μαλακῷ καὶ τ' ἄλλα ἃ δοκεῖ ἐναντιωτάτα εἶναι ἀλλήλοις, καὶ ἃ τότε ἔφαμεν ἄλλην δύναμιν ἔχειν, καὶ οὐκ εἶναι τὸ ἕτερον οἷον τὸ ἕτερον, τὰ τοῦ προσωπεύς μοῖρια, ἀμυγέπη προσέεικε, καὶ ἔστι τὸ ἕτερον οἷον τὸ ἕτερον· ὥστε τούτῳ γε τῷ τρόπῳ καὶ ταῦτα ἐλέγχεις, εἰ βούλοιο, ὡς ἅπαντα ἔστιν ὅμοια ἀλλήλοις. ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τὰ ὁμοίων τι ἔχοντα, ὅμοια δίκαιον καλεῖν· οὐ δὲ τὰ ἀνόμοίων τι ἔχοντα, ἀνόμοια, καὶ πᾶν συμκρὸν ἔχη τὸ ὁμοίων. Tom. i. P. 331. D.

In this short sentence, '*contraries alone excepted*' is foisted in by Mr. Taylor without the smallest authority. The same is to be said of '*But there are other things.*' And '*so that although you should confute these things after this manner, if you are of opinion that all things are similar to each other,*' is no more the sense of ὥστε τούτῳ γε τῷ τρόπῳ καὶ ταῦτα ἐλέγχεις, εἰ βούλοιο, ὡς ἅπαντα ἔστιν ὅμοια ἀλλήλοις, than it is of '*Arma virumque cano.*' Had he possessed any penetration, he would have seen that ὁ μὴ is a corrupt reading; and had he condescended to profit by the labours of *verbalists*, he would have adopted either the ἔστιν ὅτι or ἔστιν ἢ of Stephanus. The sense of the passage is, 'Any one thing does in some respect resemble any other; for white has a certain degree of resemblance to black, and hard to soft; and this is the case with other things which appear most contrary to each other. And even the things whose power we



lately pronounced to be distinct, and said that the one was not like the other—as, for instance, the different parts of the face—even these have a sort of resemblance, and the one is like the other. *So that by this mode of reasoning you might, if you pleased, prove all these to be similar to each other.* Nor let it appear strange that Protagoras should affirm that white and black, hard and soft, are ‘similar to each other:’ black so far resembles white, as they are both colours: hard and soft are so far alike, as they are each of them the qualities of substance. Mr. Taylor’s contempt of those *verbal critics*, as he is pleased to style them, has occasioned him to neglect in like manner an emendation in the Apology of Socrates, proposed by Muretus, approved by Forster, and confirmed by a manuscript fragment in the Bodleian Library: Τὸς υἱεῖς μου, ἐπειδὴν ἠδύσωσι, τιμωρήσασθε, ὦ ἄνδρες, τὰντὰ ταῦτα λυποῦντΕΣ ὅπερ ἔγω ὑμᾶς ἐλύπην, ἐάν ὑμῖν δοκῶσιν ἡ χρημάτων ἢ ἀλλοῦ τοῦ πρότερον ἐπιμέλεισθαι ἡ ἀρετῆς, conveys a sentiment much more worthy of the great philosopher, than is conveyed by the common reading λυποῦντΑΣ. For it was in all points of view worthy of him to recommend to the Athenians to punish his sons, in the same manner as he had punished his fellow-citizens, whenever they saw them prefer wealth to virtue; that is, to rebuke them for their folly. But to request them to punish his sons as they had punished him, when the sons gave them the same trouble that he had given, and when they pursued wealth in preference to virtue, carries absurdity in its face. For Socrates offended the Athenians by reproving their avarice and love of fame, which they attended to at the expense of their morality; and it was impossible that his children could occasion that pain by sailing down the stream, which he had given by struggling against it.

But let us return to the dialogue under our immediate consideration: it will furnish us with a few more specimens of Mr. Taylor’s *proficiency* in Grecian literature. Ἐκκρούων τοὺς λόγους, καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλων διδόναι λόγον\*, is interpreted ‘without deviating from the subject so as to prevent another from speaking†.’ He best knows how deviating from the subject could prevent another from speaking; but to us it is not so obvious: we are aware that διδόναι λόγον does sometimes mean *to give another an opportunity of speaking*; but it does not mean so in this place: it here implies *to give a reason, or an answer*; as in the Laches, p. 181, C. ἐρωτᾶσθαι καὶ διδόναι λόγον is to interrogate and to reply. But if there be any doubt on the subject, the original will remove it. Εἰ μὲν οὖν καὶ Πρωταγόρας ὑμολογεῖ φανυλότερος εἶναι Σωκράτους, διαλεχθῆναι ἔφαρκεῖ Σωκράτει. εἰ δὲ ἀντιποιεῖται, διαλεγέσθω ἐρωτῶντε καὶ ἀποκρινόμενος, μὴ ἑὸ’ ἐκάστη ἐρωτήσει μακρὸν λόγον ἀποτείνων· ἐκκρῶν τοὺς λόγους, καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλων διδόναι λόγον, ἀλλ’ ἀπομνησκύνων

\* Tom. i. p. 336. C.

† Vol. v. p. 136.

ἕως ἂν ἐπιλάβωνται περὶ οὗ τοῦ ἐρώτημα ἦν οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀκροούντων. It is clear that the latter part of this sentence signifies 'getting rid of the true subject of the discourse, unwilling to give an answer, and running out into a prolix harangue, until many of the audience forget what the question was.' Again, when he represents φιλοσοφία γὰρ ἐστὶ παλαιότατη καὶ πλείστη τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐν Κρήτῃ καὶ Λακεδαιμονίῃ, by 'philosophy is very ancient among the Greeks, and particularly in Crete and Lacedæmon,' instead of 'the Lacedæmonians and Cretans were the first who cultivated philosophy, and with them it has flourished more than in other parts of Greece,' we look in vain for that *extreme accuracy* which was promised by the translator. But this is an error which does not very materially injure the sense. The following entirely subverts it—'But the worthy man conceals the faults of his parents and country; and if any unjust conduct has led him to be enraged with them, *he is their mediator to himself, and compels them to love and praise their own offspring*,' τοὺς δ' ἀγαθοὺς (ἔφη ὁ Σιμωνίδης) ἐπικρύπτεσθαι (scil. γονέων ἢ πατρίδος πονηρίαν) καὶ ἐπαινεῖν ἀναγκάζεσθαι, καὶ ἂν τι ὀργισθῶσι τοῖς γονεῦσιν ἢ πατρίδι ἀδικηθέντες \*, αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοὺς παραμυθεῖσθαι καὶ διαλλαττεσθαι· προσαναγκάζοντας ἑαυτοὺς φιλεῖν τοὺς ἑαυτῶν καὶ ἐπαινεῖν †. That is, 'but the good man conceals the faults of his parents and country, and compels himself to praise them; and if any unjust treatment has raised his anger against them, *he soothes and reconciles himself to them, forcing himself to love and extol what is so nearly related to him*.' Ἐαυτοὺς refers most undoubtedly to ἀγαθοῦς not γονεῦσιν and πατρίδι: and if any thing in this translator could excite more than common surprise, the blunders which he has committed in so clear a passage, would have done so.

Mr. Taylor, in a note on the Republic to which we have more than once alluded, calls in question, or, to speak more properly, roundly denies, the merits of all who have gone before him; and this, forsooth, because they happened to understand their author, and forbore to obtrude on the world a rash and unnecessary emendation of a place which needed not such correction. Let, therefore, the following passage determine how well this *quick-sighted* gentleman has deserved of his author, or how far he recollected what had been written but a few pages before.

'For now it is just to attend to the coincidence in opinion of Protagoras and Socrates with each other; and if, indeed, Protagoras wishes still to interrogate, Socrates should answer; but if he wishes to reply to Socrates, Socrates should interrogate.'

\* Sic cum Steph. vulgo διαδικηθέντες.

† Tom. i. p. 346, B.

The words of the original are—*νῦν δὲ δίκαιόν ἐστιν, ἃ ὁμολογησάτην πρὸς ἀλλήλῳ Πρωταγόρας καὶ Σωκράτης. Πρωταγόρας μὲν εἰ ἐτι βούλεται ἐρωτᾶν, ἀποκρίνεσθαι Σωκράτης· εἰ δὲ δὴ βούλεται Σωκράτης ἀποκρίνεσθαι, ἐρωτᾶν τὸν Σωκράτη \**. Mr. Taylor ought to have seen that it was impossible that these words should have the meaning which he has affixed to them. He ought to have perceived the absurdity of talking about the coincidence of opinion between Protagoras and Socrates; for the fact is, there had been no coincidence of opinion between them. They had been disputing from the commencement of the dialogue; first, as to the possibility of teaching virtue; secondly, as to the sense of some expressions in Simonides. The *ἃ ὁμολογησάτην* refers to the agreement which had been formed between them respecting the manner of conducting the dialogue: *ἀλλ' οὕτως ἔθέλω* (says Socrates) *ποιῆσαι ἵν' ὁ προθυμεῖσθε, συνουσία τε καὶ διάλογοι ἡμῖν γίνωνται. εἰ μὴ βούλεται Πρωταγόρας ἀποκρίνεσθαι, οὗτος μὲν ἐρωτάτω, ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποκρινοῦμαι . . . ἐπειδὴν δὲ ἐγὼ ἀποκρινώμηναι ὅπως ἂν οὗτος βούληται ἐρωτᾶν, πάλιν οὗτος ἐμοὶ λόγον ὑποσχετέω ὁμοίως*. Tom. i. 338. C. The above passage ought therefore to have been translated somewhat after this manner—'Yet now it is but just, according to what was agreed on between Socrates and Protagoras, that Socrates, if Protagoras choose to put any further questions, should answer; but, if he prefer the part of the respondent, that Socrates should put his questions.' The reader will observe that we prefer the marginal reading of Stephanus. In the printed text it is *ἕτερον* instead of *Σωκράτης*, which in sense is the same; but we prefer the latter, as more agreeable to the general style of the passage.

We have thus seen, from a multitude of instances, how far Mr. Taylor has fulfilled his engagement—*viz.* that of giving the 'full force of every expression of his author.' We have observed also, that he can, when occasion serves, add to his original: we shall now show that he can as easily detract from it. '*Or though they (feasting and drinking) should be followed by nothing of this kind, are they bad in consequence of making men rejoice †?*' So says the translation: but the original, *ἢ καὶ εἴ τι τούτων εἰς τὸ ὑστερον μὴδὲν παρασκευάζῃ, χαίρειν δ' ὁμῶς ποιεῖ. τὸ δὲ ἀμάρτανοντα χαίρειν τοῦ κακοῦ ποιῆν εἴη ἂν ‡*. This, as all who know any thing of the language will see, is of the following import. '*Or although they should not produce at some future period any of these consequences, yet they afford men pleasure. But to receive pleasure from our faults may be considered as a punishment of our vices*. We read, it will be observed, with Stephanus, whose words are: '*Lectio hæc est veterum exemplorum, altera autem quæ extat in præcedentibus editionibus est ista, χαίρειν δὲ μόνον ποιῇ, ὁμῶς δ' ἂν κακὰ ‡, ὅτι μαθόντα χαίρειν ποιεῖ, καὶ ὅπῃ οὖν*.' This reading, we

\* Tom. i. p. 347. B.

† Vol. v. p. 147.

‡ Tom. i. p. 353. D.

presume, being unintelligible to our translator, instead of seeking for information on the passage, he mutilated it '*ad libitum*.' This gentleman indeed (from carelessness, we suppose) occasionally omits whole clauses, to the utter subversion of the sense. Take an example of the kind: it occurs at page 151, vol. v.

'If therefore we had immediately said to you that it is ignorance, you would have derided us. *For ye have acknowledged that those that err in the choice of pleasures and pains (and these are things good and evil) err through want of science, &c.*'

Every attentive reader must observe the absurdity of making the latter clause in this sentence, a consequence of the former, with which it has no connexion: but this is owing to Mr. Taylor's negligence: for, had he said, as says Plato, '*If then we had immediately said to you, It is ignorance, you would have laughed at us. BUT NOW IF YOU LAUGH AT US, YOU WILL LAUGH AT YOURSELVES ALSO; for you have acknowledged that such as err in the choice of pleasure and pain (and these are things good and evil) err from a want of knowledge,*' all would have been plain, and the consequence just and natural. The original is, *Εἰ μὲν οὖν τότε εὐθὺς ὑμῖν εἶπομεν ὅτι ἀμαθία, καταγελάτε ἄν ὑμῶν· νῦν δὲ ἂν ὑμῶν καταγελάτε, καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν καταγελάσεσθε. καὶ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ὁμολογῆκατε ἐπιστήμης ἐνδεία ἔχαμαρτάνειν περὶ τῶν ἡδονῶν ἀρεσῶν καὶ λυπῶν τοὺς ἑξαμαρτάνοντας (ταῦτα δὲ ἐστὶν ἀγαθὰ τε καὶ κακὰ).* Tom. i. p. 357. D.

We have now attended Mr. Taylor, with some degree of minuteness, through two of the dialogues; and the dialogues on which we have fixed, certainly have as fair a claim to correctness, as any of those in the present volumes which have come from his pen. But how much they fall short of that exactness and fidelity which he had given us reason to expect, is apparent from almost every page. The fair and impartial judge will own with sorrow and regret, that little is to be found in this ponderous and expensive work, that deserves his approbation and regard. He will confess too, that the dignified style of Plato is badly represented by the harsh and dissonant language with which the translation abounds. '*Nil sine labore*' is a maxim universally true. Had Mr. Taylor condescended to write less, and read more, we should perhaps not have found so great reason to express our unqualified disapprobation of his labours. We hesitate not to affirm, that to translate the Greek philosopher in a manner worthy of the public patronage, would require much greater attention and care than he seems to have bestowed upon him, as well as a much more intimate acquaintance with the language in which he wrote, than Mr. Taylor can justly pretend to. His contempt of what he calls verbal criticism has led him to despise those niceties of

speech, without an adequate knowledge of which it is impossible to do justice to the Greek writers, or to ascertain their precise meaning: and the consequence has been such as might be expected from such folly. We intend not to say, that an attention to mere verbal criticism is of itself sufficient to produce an able and accomplished scholar; but we do and will affirm, that not one instance is to be found of an able and finished scholar who was not a *proficient* in verbal criticism. Indeed, this is so obvious to such as are adequate judges, that we are always inclined to suspect those who are most eager in their condemnation of it, to be so in consequence of their own deficiency.

‘—facere quæ non possunt, verbis elevant.’

How it would be possible to translate any of our countrymen's writings into a foreign language without skill in its peculiar idioms, we leave those who are more acute than ourselves to explain. To us it appears impossible—as impossible as to read a language without knowing its characters. If this be the case (as it undoubtedly is) with a living language, what shall be said of such as have long ceased to be spoken, and which, in the course of transcription, have suffered much corruption? We must unquestionably expect just translations of writings in such languages, from those alone who are accurately acquainted with their respective particularities; who can determine what words were, or were not, in use in the ages of the respective writers; who can form a reasonable judgement as to the state of the text, and can decide, with tolerable precision, between the true and genuine readings, and the errors or interpolations of transcribers. So far therefore is verbal and emendatory criticism from meriting the abuse heaped on it by Mr. Taylor and some others, that we are indebted to it, in skilful hands, for clearing up innumerable obscurities, and removing innumerable blemishes from the pages of ancient writers.

Another cause to which may be ascribed the imperfections of the present work, we look for in *that rage of doing every thing* which appears to influence Mr. Taylor. He has, in our apprehension, reversed the old maxim, and has regarded not so much the ‘*quale*’ as the ‘*quantum*.’ But human abilities are not of such extent as to allow of an attention to a multiplicity of affairs. It requires much thought, much labour, and much perseverance, to execute a single work worthy of being handed down to posterity. What the poet has said, we would recommend to the notice of every candidate for fame: we would say to them—Before you venture to submit your writings to the public eye, consider them repeatedly; ‘*nonum prematur in annum*.’ But it is impossible that Mr. Taylor, the translator



of Pausanias, Orpheus, Alcinous, Plotinus, Apuleius, Plato, Maximus Tyrius, &c. and, as has been said, the squarer of the circle,—it is impossible for him to have done so. Indeed, the many omissions observable in the work under consideration induce us to suspect that he did not even honour it with a second perusal.

The ridiculous vanity which he possesses has been another and a fertile cause of imperfection, since it has seduced him into errors which would have been avoided by a more modest man. Thinking, as he does, that his attainments are superior in value to the accumulated knowledge of the world, he necessarily views his own productions through the most powerful magnifiers of self-love and approbation; and he consequently obtrudes his most crude and undigested works on the public, as of infinitely greater consequence than those of all mankind. We are ever ready to say, *παντὰ ἄνδρα καὶ ἀγαπᾶν, ὅστις καὶ ἐτι οὖν λέγει φρονήσεως ἐχόμενον πρᾶγμα, καὶ ἀνδρείως ἐπεξίων διαπύνεται\**: but we cannot consider Mr. Taylor as coming under that description. Had he passed the time which has been devoted to the defence of pagan absurdities, in acquiring sound and useful information; had he, instead of adopting the wild reveries of Platonic commentators, men who busied themselves in fathering on their founder sentiments of which he possibly never dreamed, and who have attempted to discover profound wisdom beneath every expression which they were unable, without this, to explain; had he, we say, instead of doing this, contented himself with collecting what would contribute to the rational illustration of his author, he would have had a much stronger claim to our approbation than he has at present. And with respect to ourselves, it would have been more satisfactory to us to have journeyed through fields enriched with wholesome fruit, than to have toiled through paths overgrown with thorns.

Let it not be imagined that we delight in censure, or that we have fixed on the worst parts of the works as the subjects of our animadversions—No. Any other dialogues would have afforded equal scope for objection. Does any man doubt it? Let us convince him of this truth. Take a proof from the Laches.

‘You speak well, Laches; but, perhaps, *I from not speaking clearly am the cause of my not perceiving that you do not answer that which I asked, but something else.*’ Vol. v. p. 193.

We must beg to be informed how the obscurity of the question put by Socrates to Laches, could render Socrates more or less capable of perceiving that the answer made by Laches was irrelevant to the subject? Mr. Taylor, we suppose, can ex-

---

\* Plat. Euthyd.



plain it; which is more than we can do. In the mean time we must content ourselves with saying, the original has nothing to do with *perceiving*. It only says, 'Well said, Laches; but, perhaps, from not speaking clearly, I am the cause of your not making that reply which I had in my thoughts when I asked the question, but a different one.' Εὐ μὲν λέγεις, ὦ Λάχης· ἀλλ' ἴσως ἐγὼ ἀπίος οὐ σαφῶς ἐπικῶν, τὸ σὲ ἀποκρίνεσθαι, μὴ τὸτο ὃ διανοούμενος ἤρομην, ἀλλ' ἕτερον\*. What could have induced Mr. Taylor to give so ridiculous a translation of the words, it is impossible to conjecture. We have before observed that he does not sufficiently attend to the general scope of his author, upon which, where the words, abstractedly considered, will admit of a twofold meaning, every thing depends; and we corroborate this assertion by the following example, which occurs in page 200 of the fifth volume.

'*Nic.* Tell me this: do you say that it is better to all men to live; and that it is not more advantageous to many to die?

'*Lach.* I do say this.

'*Nic.* To those therefore to whom it is advantageous to die, do you think the same things dreadful, as to those to whom it is better to live?'

Had Laches affirmed, as Mr. Taylor makes him do, that it was '*better to all men to live,*' and that it was '*not advantageous to many to die,*' the subsequent question of Nicias would have been most absurd. The original, though it may, at first sight, appear to imply this, will be found, we think, on consideration, not to do so. The words of Plato are, ΝΙΚ. Σὺ πᾶσι φης ἀμεινον εἶναι ζῆν; καὶ οὐ πολλοῖς κρείττον γε τεθνάναι; ΛΑΧ. Ἐγὼ γε τοῦτό γε†. The τοῦτό γε, in our apprehension, confines the assent of Laches to the latter part of the question. We would, therefore, thus freely translate the passage: '*Do you say, then, that life is preferable for every man; and are there not many to whom death would be more advantageous?*' Lach. I allow that there are.' By understanding the passage in this manner we avoid all absurdity; the reasoning proceeds as it ought; and the subsequent question of Nicias is well timed and well placed. A similar inattention to what the context requires, has betrayed Mr. Taylor into a like mistake a few pages afterwards; where, in the dialogue named Lysis, he translates μὴ οὐ τοῦτό σε κωλύῃ—'*see whether it is not this which prevents you;*' while the sense evidently requires, *I fear it is not this which prevents you.*

Before we quit the Laches, we will venture to propose an emendation of a passage which appears to us to have been slightly corrupted—εἰ μὲν γὰρ συνεφερέσθην τῷδε, ἦττον ἂν τοῦ

\* Tom. ii. p. 190. E. Ed. Steph.

† Tom. ii. p. 195. Ed. Steph.

τοιούτου ἔδει· νῦν δὲ, τὴν ἐναντίαν γὰρ (scil. ἐλλήν), ὡς ὁρᾷς, Λάχης Νικία ἔθετο, εὐ δὲ ἔχει καὶ σοῦ ἀκούσαι ποτέρῳ τῶν ἀνδρῶν σύμψηφος εἶ. ΣΩΚ. Τί δὲ, ὦ Λυσίμαχε; ὅποτε ἂν οἱ πλείους ἐπαινῶσιν ἡμῶν, τούτοις μέλλεις χρῆσθαι; ΛΥ. Τί γὰρ ἂν τις ποίῃ, ὦ Σώκρατες; ΣΩΚ. Ἡ καὶ σὺ, ὦ Μελεσία, οὕτως ἂν ποίῃς; καὶν εἴτις περὶ ἀγωνίας τοῦ ὕψους σοὶ βουλὴ εἴη τί χρὴ ἀσκεῖν, ἄρα τοῖς πλείοσιν ἂν ἡμῶν πείθοιο, ἢ καὶν ὅστις τυγχάνει ὑπὸ παιδοτρίβη ἀγαθῷ πεπαιδευμένος ἢ καὶ ἡσκηκώς\*; Here, instead of ὅποτε, we would read ὅποια. How easily ὅποι' ἂν might be turned into ὅποτ' ἂν, and thence into ὅποτε ἂν, is obvious. The sentence, thus amended, we would translate as follows:—‘Had these, indeed, coincided in opinion, this would have been less necessary; but now, since Laches, as you see, differs from Nicias, it is certainly proper to learn to whom you give your suffrage. Soc. What then, Lysimachus, will you adopt those measures which the majority of us recommend? Lys. What can one do, Socrates? Soc. Would you do so also, Melesias? And if you were consulting as to the manner in which your son should prepare himself for a gymnastic contest, would you follow the advice of the majority of us, or would you follow his who had been educated under a skilful master, or had even exercised the art himself?’ Mr. Taylor translates the words ὅποτε ἂν οἱ πλείους ἐπαινῶσιν ἡμῶν, τούτοις μέλλεις χρῆσθαι, by ‘if the many praise us, will you make use of them?’ But what has this to do with what goes before, and follows after it? By what mode of construction can this sense be drawn from the words? We believe it would be difficult to find an example, in which ἐπαινέω governs a genitive: ἡμῶν is unquestionably governed by πλείους; and we doubt not that Plato’s meaning is such as we have represented it, and that ὅποτε is a corrupt reading.

Now we are speaking of corruptions, we know not whether the following passage in the Lysis have not suffered a small one; it is as follows:

‘Ἄρα μὴ (ἦν δ’ ἐγὼ) ὦ Μενέξετε, το παράπαν οὐκ ὁρθῶς ἐξητοῦμεν; \*Εμοίγε δοκεῖ, ὦ Σωκράτες, ὁ Λύσις. καὶ ἅμα εἰπὼν ἠρυθρίασεν. ἐδόκει γὰρ μοι ἀκοντ’ αὐτὸν ἐκφεύγειν τὸ λεχθὲν διὰ τὸ σφάδρα προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν τοῖς λεγόμενοις· ὅγλος δ’ ἦν καὶ ὅτε ἡμεῖς αὐτοῖς [οὐκ] οὕτως ἔχων. Ἐγὼ οὖν βουλόμενος τὸν τε Μενέξενον ἀναπαύσαι, καὶ ἐκείνου ἡσθεῖς τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ, οὕτω μεταβαλὼν, πρὸς τὸν Λύσιν ἐποιούμην τοὺς λόγους. Καὶ εἶπον, ὦ Λύσι, ἀλλήλῃ μὴ δοκεῖς λέγειν ὅτι εἰ ὁρθῶς ἐσκοπούμεν, οὐκ ἂν ποτε οὕτως ἐπλανώμεθα. Tom. 2. 213. D.

We are almost inclined to suspect the οὐκ which we have inclosed within crotchets. If it be omitted, the οὕτως ἔχων we should refer to προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν; if it be retained, we should refer the words to ἠρυθρίασεν. Mr. Taylor, and the

\* Tom. ii. p. 184. D.

Latin translator Serranus, have completely mistaken the sense of the words. The former thus renders them :

‘ Consider therefore, Menexenus, whether the investigation has been *perfectly right*. Lysis replied, To me it *appears so*, Socrates ; and at the same time he said this, he blushed : *for he appeared to me unwilling to avoid what was said, through the great attention he paid to the discourse*. I, therefore, being willing that Menexenus should cease from speaking ; and being delighted with *his philosophy*, thus transferred my discourse to Lysis, and said, O Lysis ! what you have asserted appears to me to be true ; I mean, that if we have rightly considered, *we shall not in any respect have wandered from the truth.*’

To any man who is conversant with the Greek, it must be manifest that Lysis asserted the investigation *NOT* to have been properly conducted. It must be apparent also, that δῆλος δὲν ὅτε ἡκροάτο [οὐκ] οὕτως ἐχόν is not noticed, and that the whole sentence is violated and distorted. Plato evidently means to say ;

‘ Consider then, Menexenus, whether our inquiry have *NOT* been improperly conducted. To me it appears so, said Lysis ; and upon saying so, he blushed. *For it appeared to me that what he said had escaped from him involuntarily, in consequence of the great attention which he had paid to the conversation ; for he had manifestly listened very attentively\**. Desirous, therefore, of silencing Menexenus, and *delighted with the love of knowledge which I observed in Lysis*, I transferred the conversation to him, and said, Lysis, *you appear to me to have justly observed, that, had our inquiry been properly conducted, we should not have fluctuated as we have done.*’

The blush of Lysis was occasioned by his sense of having replied to a question which was put to Menexenus.—It is truly curious to observe the shifts to which Mr. Taylor has been reduced in translating the above. By omitting μὴ in the beginning of the sentence, he has made Lysis affirm that the inquiry had been *rightly* conducted. But when he came to the end of it, he perceived, that, according to Socrates, Lysis had affirmed it to have been *improperly* conducted. How was this to be reconciled ? Why, by making ἐπλανωμένα the *imperfect*, equivalent to what is called by grammarians the *future perfect*.—In some instances, however, Mr. Taylor does not regard such trifles as contradictions and impossibilities ; we may select an example from the following paragraph : ‘ More than any thing therefore it will follow, if temperance is alone the science of

---

\* We thus translate the words, upon the supposition that οὐκ is not genuine ; but, however this may be, the *general* sense of the passage will be the same. REV.

science, and the science of ignorance, that *neither he who knows the medical art, nor he who does not*, will be able to distinguish the true or pretended physician; *nor can any other person who is knowing in any thing whatever be able to accomplish this, except him who is knowing in the same art*, as is the case with other artists\*.' So then, Mr. Taylor, neither he who is a physician, nor he who is *not*, can distinguish the *true* from the pretended physician; and yet he who is 'knowing in the same art,' *that is, a physician*, can do so!—that is, a physician both can, and cannot, make this discovery. Does Plato assert such nonsense? Let us hear him. Παντὸς ἄρα μᾶλλον, εἰ ἢ σωφροσύνη ἐπιστήμης ἐπιστήμη μόνον ἐστὶ καὶ ἀνεπιστημοσύνης ἐπιστήμη, οὔτε ἰατρὸν διακρίναι οἶατε ἔσται ἐπιστάμενον τὰ τῆς τέχνης, ἢ μὴ ἐπιστάμενον, προσποιούμενον δὲ ἢ οἰόμενον· οὔτε ἄλλον οὐδένα τῶν ἐπισταμένων καὶ οἰούν· πλὴν γε τὸν αὐτοῦ ὁμοτέχνον, ὥσπερ οἱ ἄλλοι δημιουργοί†. The English reader will be surprised when we inform him that Plato says—'It is self-evident, that if temperance be the knowledge of science, and the knowledge of ignorance only, it (temperance) will not be able to distinguish the physician who is skilled in his profession, from him who is not skilled, but merely pretends or thinks that he is. Nor can it distinguish who is skilled in any other art, excepting only the possessor of its own art, as is the case with other artists.' Thus Plato says, reasonably enough, that a temperate man, according to the account of Critias, would be unable to distinguish the real and pretended physician; he could only distinguish who was really temperate, and who was not. So, in the Cratylus, Mr. Taylor fathers his own nonsense upon Plato: 'Hence it is evident, that a fluxion contrary to every fluxion is not fortitude, but that which flows contrary to the just.' So that fortitude and justice are directly opposed to each other! Plato, however, gives a very different account: δῆλον οὖν ὅτι οὐ πάση ῥοῇ ἢ ἐναντία ῥοῇ ἀνδρεία ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ τῇ παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον ῥέσει.—'It is manifest that the motion which is contrary to every motion is *not* fortitude, but it is the motion which is contrary to that which opposes justice.'

Discoveries in history are of the last importance; and it would be unpardonable in us to conceal from the public Mr. Taylor's merit in this particular. Socrates is represented in the Hipparchus, at page 362 of the present translation, as saying,

'I therefore being your friend dare not deceive you, and oppose the mandate of so great a man, (Hipparchus), after whose death the Athenians were under tyrannic subjection to his brother Hippias. And you must have heard from all old men, that there never was a tyranny in Athens till these three years past.'

\* Vol. v. p. 262.

† Tom. ii. p. 171. C.

So then, according to this account, the tyranny of Hippias commenced three years before this was spoken by Socrates; and it was necessary to ask of the old men what had happened three years before!!—And can Plato be supposed capable of making Socrates assert such a falsehood? Can he have represented him so ignorant of history, and even so forgetful of the transactions of his own time, as to state that to have happened in his life-time, nay, within three years of the time when he spoke, which took place long before he was born? No. But Mr. Taylor, with his usual luck at blundering, has given a meaning to the words of his author which they were not intended to convey. Plato says, *'after whose death, the Athenians continued three years under the despotic government of his brother Hippias: and you must have heard from all old men that these were the only years in which a despotic government existed in Athens.* οὐ καὶ ἀποθάνοντος τρία ἔτη ἐτυραννεύθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰππίου. καὶ πάντων ἄν τῶν παλαιῶν ἤκεσας ὅτι ταῦτα μόνα τὰ ἔτη τυραννὶς ἐγένετο ἐν Ἀθήναις. Tom. ii. p. 229. B.

(To be concluded in our next.)

ART. II.—*Munimenta Antiqua; or Observations on antient Castles. Including Remarks on the whole Progress of Architecture, ecclesiastical as well as military, in Great Britain: and on the corresponding Changes, in Manners, Laws, and Customs. Tending both to illustrate modern History: and to elucidate many interesting Passages in various antient classic Authors. With Plates. By Edward King, Esq. F. R. S. &c. Vol. II. Folio. 3l. 13s. 6d. Boards. G. and W. Nicol.*

ALTHOUGH our return to the durable fortresses of this accomplished antiquary, has been long obstructed, we have not ceased to admire the persevering efforts of his skill and erudition. The title-page adequately announces an arduous enterprise, its character and tendency. In the *second* division of his comprehensive plan, Mr. King, amidst various interesting inquiries, distinctively examines the *military works of the Romans* in our island, imitated afterwards, in many respects, by the *Britons* and the *Saxons*. We shall trace his progress as minutely as the nature of our journal will allow, enumerate facts, abridge reasonings and conjectures, and glance at remarks which seem desultory or irrelevant.

Dissertations by former antiquaries on the *general architecture of the Romans*,—a paucity of remains in this country, except military walls and camps,—and investigations already pursued with success by general Roy and general Melville, through many principal stations, roads, and ports,—have influenced



Mr. King to comprehend this department of his work 'in the smaller compass.'

*Works entirely Roman* are considered in preference to *Brito-Roman* fortresses. The last are distinguished as places of defence originally formed by the *Britons*, improved or adapted to use by the *Romans*, and, in more recent ages, occasionally converted into strong-holds by the *Saxons*, *Danes*, and *Normans*. Among the few military structures entirely Roman, of which 'the particularities' are explained, **RICHBOROUGH**, in Kent, the earliest and best preserved, 'claims our first attention.' Mr. *Boys* of Sandwich, occupier of the land, who had indefatigably traced these walls and foundations, furnished the author with exact plans. Aided by his own observations on the spot, he is induced to conclude that **RICHBOROUGH** may be considered as a complete illustration of the general mode of constructing *original Roman fortresses in Britain*.

Discovered medals, coins, and historical fragments, support the opinion that in the time of *Claudius* this *castrum* was formed near the usual landing-place of the Romans, where *Julius Cæsar*, 'after he sailed from the heights near Dover, is with good reason believed to have arrived;' and *St. Paul*, unexpectedly introduced, is also supposed to have landed. To elucidate the disputable opinion that *Vespasian*, actual conqueror of Britain, here held a command in the time of *Claudius*, we are referred to strong reasons adduced by the late Dr. *Henry* in his *History of Great Britain*. 'Here *Agricola* also first arrived, after the conquest of the Isle of Wight, in the time of *Domitian*.'

**RICHBOROUGH** commanded one of the mouths of an æstuary where once floated the navy of Rome, between the Isle of Thanet, then really an island, and the British shore. *Nunc durat solum*. Meadows, bordering on the insignificant rivulet the *Sarre* or *Stour*, have usurped the tract. **RECVLVER**, a similar fortress, commanded the other entrance of this port.

The walls of **RICHBOROUGH** (it is presumed by *Battely* (*Antiq. Rutupin.*), *Harris*, *Leland*, and *Lewis*, on whose reasonings Mr. King relies) were begun about the year 43; and were in part completed or enlarged under the emperor *Severus*, about the year 205. The first stone, the author imagines, was laid by *Aulus Plautius*, the prætor, and earliest governor of the fortress; whose wife, *Pomponia Græcina*, a convert to Christianity, tried, as *Tacitus* narrates, for embracing a strange superstition, was by the Roman laws acquitted of 'any thing immoral.' The early propagation of Christianity, and its progress in Britain, subjects of a lengthened note, we must abandon, to pursue the principal subject.

Situate on the extreme point of a promontory 'close to a steep precipice eastward,' at the foot of which was once the haven, *Richborough* is conjectured to have been originally founded



on a small and distinct island: *Thanet* was then an isle on a much larger scale. 'The slip of land between this spot and *Gursum* is even now sometimes quite overflowed.'

In these remains, are discoverable the principal parts of a perfect *stationary* camp.

The *upper* division was allotted to the generals and chief officers, the *lower* to the legions. In the first, Mr. King presumes, was situate the *prætorium*, with its parade; the *principia*, comprising the *augurale* or place for sacrifice; and the *sacellum*, or temple containing the principal ensigns, particularly the *eagles*, — objects of superstitious veneration among the Romans, — *thought* to be the 'abomination of desolation' mentioned in the scriptures. It appears to the author highly probable, that some of the same kind, which had been placed in this identical building by *Vespasian*, were afterwards carried by him against *Jerusalem*, and are alluded to in the tremendous prophecy of the destruction of that city. Similar fancies are frequent.

The *four* great gates of a stationary camp are traced amidst the walls of this *castrum*; the *decuman*, or largest gate, which allowed *ten* men to pass abreast—the *postern* or *first principal gate*, near the quarters of the chief officers,—the *prætorian gate*, here also the *water gate*,—and the *second principal gate*, nearly opposite to the *postern*.

On the outside of the walls, the Roman *towers*, of which the foundations have been discovered, were added, as their construction evinces, *after* the completion of the original fabric.

Unaided by engraved plans, we can only attempt to exhibit an imperfect sketch of an encampment esteemed among our most valuable and genuine military remains.

Its *form* only deviates from a *square* in obedience to the inequalities of the ground. Of its magnitude and construction, the *north wall* and its masonry offer an interesting specimen.

'On approaching the ruins, the eye is struck with the magnificent appearance of the north-eastern wall, commonly called the north wall; which is, on the outside, in some parts, near 30 feet high, from the ground; and, in many others, about 23:—and is 560 feet in length; and at least 5 feet, in depth, or breadth, from the lower row of bricks down to the foundation.—Its thickness, at bottom, is, in general, from 11 to 12 feet; but it is in some parts even thirteen feet\*.' Vol. ii. p. 6.

To æconomy of labour and expense, the Romans, in these structures, appeared not inattentive.

The *outer* surfaces were *facings* formed by lines, or courses of squared stones and of brick, in alternate rows. The *internal*

---

\* 'In most parts the wall, to a height of about six feet, is eleven feet three inches thick; and afterwards only ten feet eight inches.'

part, between these 'two uprights,' was filled with the common materials of the country, slate, chalk, flint, grit, free-stone, or other rubbish indiscriminately; with *cement*, or *mortar*, spread or poured over the mixture at proper distances. The solidity of this workmanship has been proved by its duration, which may, perhaps, be ascribed either to an accurate admixture of the substances which formed the cement, or to a just distribution of the cement itself accommodated to the quality of the materials.

At RICHBOROUGH the foundations, as Mr. *Boys* relates, were thus compacted :

' First *two* rows of bolder stones lie on the natural soil, which is a solid pitsand ;—then a thin stratum of chalk nodules ;—next a *single* row of bolders ; and over them another thin layer of small chalk ;—all these being without cement :—then bolders again, mixed with mortar ;—and so the masonry proceeds internally, with a confused mixture of large bolders, ochre stones, sand stone, and blocks of chalk, with fossil *pholades* bedded therein, and also *balani* on their surfaces ;—the whole cemented with a mortar formed of lime, grit, large and small pebbles, sea shells, and fragments of baked bricks.' Vol. ii. p. 7.

On walls which have so long withstood the assaults of time, contemplation must be indulged. The descriptions which follow will compensate for their extent by the curious researches which they develope.

' The outside of this great north-east wall is very beautiful to the eye ; as well as magnificent. It is composed (as far as now remains), in general of seven great, and fair, distinct rows of stone ; each of them very nearly four feet thick :—and each of them consisting, in general, of seven courses of separate stones.

' The measure of the great combined courses sometimes varies a little (some being four feet three inches, whilst others are only three feet three inches in breadth, or rather in depth ;) which may therefore perhaps indicate an intention of forming them about *four Roman feet* in breadth, or depth, upon an average.

' These great courses of stone are separated from each other, by six smaller courses of bricks, composed each merely of a double row of bricks, that are about an inch and a half (or an inch and three quarters in thickness) ; but are of very different breadths ; from eight inches to a foot ; and of very different lengths ;—some being fourteen ;—some sixteen inches long ;—and some seventeen and an half ;—a variation of dimensions to be met with in some other Roman structures.—For in the old wall of Verulam, was a brick, now worked up in the wall of the abbey at St. Alban's, which is very nearly two feet in length : and there is one at Dover near three feet in length.

' The composition of these bricks is also as various as their dimensions.—Some of them are entirely red throughout their whole substance ; (like our modern bricks ;) only of a deeper colour :—some are red on the outsides ; but of a deep blue within ;—the internal

substance being formed of a different earth from the outside; (perhaps for the sake of sparing the better and scarcer material.)

And here again we find a great similarity to other Roman works; for in the walls of Chesterford, Verulam, and Silchester, are exactly the same varied appearances.

Some of the bricks also, here at Richborough, are of a yellow colour; having plainly been composed only of mud and clay taken from the neighbouring shore. And some of these latter might possibly have been merely dried by the sun; but how the red ones should become of *that* colour, without the aid of fire;—or how any (except the yellow ones) should have been dried in the sun; as has been hastily conjectured by some antiquaries, I cannot comprehend.

Let them have been formed how they will; the whole produces still a very beautiful effect to the eye.

The structure is every where, uniformly, of this sort of style;—except in some very few parts; where reparations have plainly been made in *Saxon times*; and with squared stones of a much smaller size; and with herring-bone work.' Vol. ii. p. 8.

That *any* bricks, red or yellow, dried by the sun alone in this climate, should be durable in exposed situations, is assuredly a ridiculous conjecture.

The several alternate rows, or courses of stone and brick, (here described, as appearing in this wall,) were by the Greeks, who lived in Roman times, called *θεμέλιοι* or *θεμέλια*; and are the kind of ornaments alluded to by St. John, as being so highly beautiful, according to every one's apprehension, in his days; when, in his emblematical representation of the walls of the Holy City, in the prophecy of the Revelations, he speaks of such being formed of precious stones. The word, *θεμέλια*, is in our translation of the passage, very improperly rendered, as far as relates to a consistency with our modern ideas, *foundations*; instead of *courses*: and this mistranslation occasions much confusion in the minds of most persons, who attempt to read the prophet's sublime description.

Nevertheless the reason why these alternate rows either of brick, or of smooth flat stones, were antiently, called *θεμέλια* *θεμέλιοι*, *foundations*, (though the word seems now so uncouth, and inapplicable, in our ears,) is yet apparent enough. For whoever examines Roman walls attentively, will find, that most usually the broader alternate rows of rude stone, or flints, or rubble, and mortar, were evidently constructed, merely by having the whole mass flung carelessly into a great *caisson*, or frame of wood, whose interior *breadth* was that of the wall; and whose *depth* was that of the space between the alternate rows of bricks; and whose length was sometimes more, and sometimes less, just as suited convenience: and that the parts thus reared, one at the end of another, on, and over each row of bricks, were united together afterwards, merely by means of very small loose stones, and mortar, thrown into the narrow space left at the ends between them.—As therefore these *caissons* were removed up from one row of bricks or smooth stones to another superior row, in constant repetition, according as the wall advanced in height; and were placed

successively upon every row; those substantial rows of bricks regularly placed, might very well be called *θεμέλιοι*, or *θεμέλια*, or *foundations*; because, indeed, *such* they really were, the whole way up, to those identical building frames.

‘And, indeed, I have sometimes thought, that those numerous small square holes, found in some of the Roman walls, and even at *Richborough*, perforating their substance, at different heights, were left by the very timbers made use of to support these *caissons*.

‘It is not, however, meant to be here asserted, that all Roman walls were just so built; — because, where the outsides of the alternate courses were not to be left quite rough; but were to be adorned with a smooth facing of regular squared stones; as many of them now appear to be; and were moreover of great thickness; it is very probable such facings, on each side of the wall, might be first regularly raised, by masonry, in lieu of the *sides of caissons*; and then the confused heap of stones, rubble, and mortar, might be merely thrown in between those strong facings.’ Vol. ii. p. 9.

In this north-eastern wall is a *side-gate*, which, being situate nearest to the quarters of the chief officers, was originally, by the Romans, denominated one of the *principal gates*, but has been since named the *postern gate*. Almost indistinguishable externally, its peculiar construction and sudden turn cannot be clearly explained without a delineation.

This passage, at first parallel with the wall, quickly turns at a right angle to enter the encampment. Its *width*, which in the first direction is four feet, spreads, on its *turning*, to seven feet eight inches. Its length in one direction is ten feet four inches, in the other, fifteen feet. The whole of the internal area of the great castrum, now a corn-field, is seen at one view, with its hillock, covered with briars, on which stood the *prætorium*.

On its *northern* side, as is usual in ancient remains, the wall is observed to be in better preservation than on its *southern* face.

In the north-western wall an open space of *peculiar* breadth indicates the situation of the *decuman gate*, a discovery which Mr. King vindicates with confidence. No fragments of wall remain in the opening: a complete pavement is found of solid stones similar to that of the *postern gate*, twenty-one feet one inch in breadth, affording ‘exactly sufficient space for *ten men* to march abreast.’ Adapted to sudden sallies, and consequently more open to assault, this gate owed its strength rather to its defenders than to its construction: a decision which the authority of passages in *Cæsar* and *Livy* seems to confirm.

An error, by which, as the author candidly confesses, he was once himself deluded, is here discovered in the able work of general Roy—‘the mistaking the PRÆTORIAN GATE for the DECUMAN,’ and the *front* of a Roman camp for its *rear*. Citations from Polybius and *Livy* by which the general has endeavoured

to illustrate his opinion, are ingeniously turned against him by Mr. King.

Within the *postern gate*, directing the sight 'from the great north-west wall' and 'from the *decuman gate* on the right, towards the left,' we perceive no wall, but merely overlook a steep precipice. The eye rests 'upon marshes, which were *once the sea*.' 'Besides this defence' of the precipice, at the eastern corner of the camp is supposed to have been either a continuation and return of the wall from the summit to the shore by a fortified descent which contained the *third* or *prætorian gate*; or, if it be admitted that a part of the elevated ground has fallen, and that the walls were originally continued in straight lines on a level above the existing stream, the *prætorian gate* may be placed 'directly opposite to the *decuman gate*' and turned towards the æstuary.

The *prætorian gate* was always nearest to the quarters of the general and to the *prætorium*, on the side of the encampment most exposed to attack.

A fragment of wall only remains next to the precipice, where a large breach is seen on the side of the camp opposite to the *postern entrance*. Here, it is presumed, was the *fourth gate*, called by the Romans the *second principal gate*, near the quarters of the chief officers.

The foundations of the *round towers*, about eighteen feet in diameter, subsequently added at the north and west corners, are less deep than those of the wall itself; the alternate courses of brick range differently, and the angles of the original walls project considerably into the basis of the towers. The strength of the original castrum was in no respect diminished by these additions, attributed to the æra of *Severus*.

After our rapid survey of the *exterior walls*, we enter the *internal area*. An admeasurement seems to show the extent—from the *north-east* to the *south-west wall*, 466 feet;—and from the *north-west wall* to the *steep bank* on the *south-eastern side*, 536 feet. Mr. Boys thinks the camp was once a regular parallelogram.

From the *postern gate* a straight ideal line is drawn through the enclosure, dividing the *upper* and *lower castrum*. On the right, Mr. King places the *lower camp*; disposes in streets the tents and huts of the common soldiers;—places in the midst the *equites*, or Roman horse;—on each side, the troops named *triarii* and *principes*;—and beyond these, on each side, the *hastati*, with the '*mercenaries*, or foreign troops.'

On the left of this imaginary line, extends the *upper camp*. Here he fixes the tents of the principal officers, of the young patricians, and of the '*noble volunteers*' named *imperatoris contubernales*: here he spreads the pavilion of the general, and raises the *prætorium*.



Beneath the site of this supposed *prætorium*, has been found a regular platform 144 feet six inches in length, 104 feet in breadth, and five feet in depth; of impenetrable masonry composed of flint stones and strong mortar, a coat of which is spread over the whole surface, extends to the edges, and affords no break or appearance of building except an elevated basis in the centre, in the form of a cross.

This raised foundation, in the most conspicuous part, extends in length forty-six feet eight inches, and in breadth twenty-two feet. The two *ala*, which form the transverse of the cross, are, 'each, thirty-two feet six inches in length, and seven feet six inches in breadth.'

On the platform, 'there cannot remain a doubt,' was 'the great *parade* or *augurale* belonging to the *prætorium*;' and on the foundation which we have described, sometimes called *St. Austin's cross*, rose the *SACELLUM*. The walls, one foot and half in thickness, formed in the 'body of the building' 'a sort of room,' forty-three feet eight inches in length, and nineteen feet in breadth, 'fit for the reception of the *principal eagles* of the several legions to be placed at the upper end.' The two wings, each internally thirty-one feet in length, and four feet and half in width, a proportion inappropriate to other purposes, were 'admirably well adapted to receive, as mere cells, the numerous military standards of the subordinate divisions to be placed leaning against the walls.'

A Christian chapel, it is admitted, was probably in later ages constructed on this spot. 'Places of pagan superstition were often used for Christian worship;' and as these foundations differ in shape from a catholic cross, *St. Austin* is not permitted to obliterate the recollection of an *augurale* and *sacellum*. To his conjectures Mr. King adds a few corroborating facts.

'On removing the earth around, to clear the surface, there were found, boars' tusks; cinders; and wood coals; and other indications of remains of sacrifices; besides pieces of brass, iron, and lead; and pieces of broken vessels: and flat pieces of alabaster, with numeral letters on them.' Vol. ii. p. 19.

Not only the platform of the *augurale*, but the 'whole ground-plot of the *castrum* had originally been smoothed' and rendered compact 'over the natural soil.'

'In digging under all these foundations, to make these various discoveries, was found, at the bottom of all; (and therefore plainly in a place where it must have been lost, and buried *before the works were first begun*,) a little bronze figure of a Roman soldier, playing upon a pair of bag-pipes.' Vol. ii. p. 21.

'It seems to have been part of the *Ephippia*, or horse trappings, of some Roman knight; and to have been designed to be suspended be-



fore the breast of the horse; hung on, by leathern thongs passing through the two cavities behind the pipe; and secured, at bottom, by another thong passing through a similar cavity in the brass work, beneath the feet, which part is now broken off.

'The whole equipment of the figure is most curious;—the precise form of the bag, and pipes;—and the manner of holding, and managing them; the helmet;—the purse, or *antient scrip*, on one side;—and the short Roman sword, or dagger, on the other;—and the coat, and belt.—And the whole is a proof, that the *bag-pipe* was originally no Scotch, but a Roman instrument;—a fact that is also strongly corroborated by the bas-relievo at Rome mentioned by *Dr. Burney*: where a Grecian sculptor has given, in like manner, the representation of this instrument.

'It is not unlikely that the Scotch borrowed the modern bag-pipe, from the old Roman double pipe;—as they did the *plaid*, and the mode of wearing it, from the Roman *toga*.' Vol. ii. p. 21.

'A similar little bronze was found on the outside of the walls; and other bronze figures have also been found here; particularly a figure of Mercury:—and a vast quantity of Roman coins, of such kinds as might be expected in a camp, that is, of small ones, of little value, have also been frequently dug up.' Vol. ii. p. 22.

To sketch the characteristic features of a Roman stationary encampment, we have halted at *Richborough*: through the remaining posts, our march will be accelerated.

We proceed to *Portchester*, a station of the highest antiquity, where '*Vespasian* unquestionably planted his *tremendous standards*,' and, perhaps, first landed. The fortress is minutely described. Its ancient dimensions exceed those at *Richborough*. A strong-hold during so many ages, from the æra of the *Saxons* to the time of queen *Elizabeth*, it has received 'vast and extremely various additions,' which are here 'brought into one fair state of comparison.' Courses of brick, as before described, divide the ancient stone-work. Of the *original* towers *three* remain; the *fourth* is replaced by a *Saxon keep tower*. The Roman, Saxon, and Norman portions of the building, are acutely discriminated, and judiciously illustrated by plans. Roman fortresses of similar construction, in form and disposition of materials, to *Richborough* and *Portchester*, are observable in remote regions, particularly at *Nicopolis*, and near *Cairo* in *Egypt*.

At *Pevensey*, the ruins are explored with equal diligence. Here we contemplate the remains of a grand *decuman gate*, twenty-nine feet in breadth, with massive *round towers* on each side, sixteen feet in diameter. This *castrum*, following the irregularities of the ground, differs from the usual square form; a variation to which many acute and learned observations are directed. The traces of Saxon and Norman additions, frequent in

this once magnificent structure, are laboriously investigated, and accurately explained by many interesting plans, and by engraved views from the drawings of Mr. Grimm.

'To preserve this fine remain,' one of the towers undermined has been propped by *new* stone-work: a hint worthy of imitation. Venerable ruins, displaying the vicissitudes of time and manners, might be thus often saved from prostration, and, without considerable expense, reserved to instruct future ages.

'The examination of the plans, and mode of structure of these three great fortresses, at Richborough, Portchester, and Pevensey, is sufficient to explain the nature of the most perfect of the antient Roman munitions, in this island. And almost every other remain, that we can discover of their works, either perfect, or imperfect, will help to confirm the idea which the examination of these three conveys.' Vol. ii. p. 49.

We must, with regret, hurry through the remaining encampments.

'At *Castor*, in Norfolk, about three miles from the city of Norwich, we find the vestiges of another of the oldest Roman camps in Britain;—where have been dug up a prodigious quantity of Roman coins, and medals; and also bronzes, and antient Roman lamps.' Vol. ii. p. 49.

*Burgh Castle*, near Yarmouth, *Chesterford*, in Essex, and fortresses of equal and of inferior importance in England, Wales, and Scotland, are successively noticed. A *comparative view* of Roman *castra*, with their variations and irregularities, delineated by engraving, accompanies the narrative.

At *Chesterford* no towers appear. They are supposed 'to have been merely constructed of wood, and placed on the walls.' Of this practice, and other instructive particulars respecting the conduct of the Roman army, *Josephus* supplies the evidence.

The union and power created by Roman discipline render their victories less astonishing. Their camps were cities; the *boundary* fortified, the *interior* calculated either for a temporary or a durable abode. The usual habitations of our warlike *aborigines* were less stable than the most exposed and transitory posts of their opposers.

*Temporary camps, entrenchments, or earthworks*, are not left unconsidered. In Scotland, where they abound, many are well preserved. The camp at *Kirkbaddo*, so admirably described by general Roy, shows the space occupied by 10,000 men to be about 2280 feet in length, by 1080 feet in breadth. The dimensions of the *castra* already described are comparatively insignificant.

'With regard to their mode of *abiding* in these camps and

*castra*,' Mr. King has added his own ingenious remarks to information laboriously collected from the best ancient and modern authorities. The order of encamping, the characteristic difference of the *Hyginian* from the *Polybian* mode, the allotments of the several ranks of the army on the ground, the divisions, appellations, distinct services, armour, weapons, and costume of the Roman troops, are luminously detailed.

From the MILITARY REMAINS of the Romans—after noticing the *wall of Severus*, and their admirable *roads*—our indefatigable guide conducts us to their *domestic habitations*; of which the prospect is humiliating.

' A few fragments of *public baths*;—and a few traces of *villas*:—a few mutilated figures, and statues;—some tessellated pavements;—small votive altars;—and funeral inscriptions;—are all the marks of their once fancied greatness, and splendour.—And surely, had there ever been any other kind of *existing specimens* of magnificence;—had there ever been superb buildings, either of stone, or brick; some other distinguished fragments of *such* must have remained, as well as those few that have, from time to time, actually been discovered at Bath; or preserved at Dover; or at Leicester;—or in the walls of the *castra*, at Richborough, Portchester, and Pevensey;—or near the great wall of Severus.

' To take it for granted that such did exist, but were destroyed by the Saxons, and Normans, is surely hardly allowable:—for where any considerable parts of *Roman* structures, have really ever been removed, and taken away, either by the Saxons, or the Normans, there seldom fails to be evidence of such facts, from the appearance of the *Roman bricks* used in the succeeding Saxon, and Norman works;—as at Colchester castle; and at the abbey of St. Alban's.

' If even the most trifling parts of their structures, such as tessellated pavements, and the very flues of their stoves, have remained, in the perfect state we now find so many of them; surely it may with good reason be asked, how it came to pass, that the greater and more substantial parts, (if any such there ever were) should have left no traces?—and the plain conclusion must be, that in general the superstructures were at best slight,—and often of wood;—and not like those very few more stately edifices, whose remains have really been found so long preserved any where;—either at Bath;—or at Leicester;—or at Canterbury;—or at Dover.' V.L. ii. p. 162.

Raillery is employed to combat our early *prejudices* in favour of Roman magnificence in *private* as well as in *national* structures. Tessellated pavements, their materials, texture, and design, are minutely examined. The mere *fragility* of these *floors* cannot, in our judgement, necessarily imply a *slight superstructure*: nor can a few traces of inconsiderable *porticoes*, or of *confined apartments*, satisfactorily prove a *general* inelegance in their dwellings, or that their buildings seldom exceeded in elevation a single story. Although the discoveries of Mr. Lysons

at Woodchester, and the learned speculations of Mr. King on the *Laurentine* villa of Cicero, may give an air of plausibility to his conclusions, *we* perceive no adequate facts to show 'that the *Romans* had it not in their power to import into this country any much *higher* specimens of *domestic convenience and comfort*.'

OF AMPHITHEATRES, BASILICÆ, ARCHED WALLS, OR ARCHED GATES, frequent in Italy, the traces here are rare. Hence it is imagined that Britain was considered as a remote and *inferior* province.

ROMAN ARCHES in England are usually of rude construction, and, in number, inconsiderable. This subject gradually leads to a novel and excellent dissertation on the *earliest use of the ARCH* in buildings.

'*Arches*, and *domes*, were indeed only in an imperfect degree, and on a small scale, introduced by the Romans into Britain. Nor is this at all surprising; if we are indeed to conclude, that the *arch* itself was, in those days, in reality only a *recent invention*.' Vol. ii. r. 222.

Neither *holy-writ*, nor *Homer* (in the original), nor *Herodotus*, nor does the Greek language itself, possess a *word* properly denoting this form. No arches existed in Solomon's Temple, in Egyptian Thebes, in the Pyramids, at Babylon, in the ancient Hindu buildings, at Persepolis in Persia, among the Remains at Pæstum, at Athens, in the Temple of Diana at Ephesus, or even in Rome itself 'long prior to the time of Augustus.'

The ARCH 'was probably invented by ARCHIMEDES, only a little before the Augustan age.'

In the Supplement to Montfaucon's Antiquities, on two representations of Egyptian bas reliefs, we observe an *arched canopy*, and an *arched door-way*. We have had no opportunity to ascertain the date of their execution, which, we may presume, was *after* the period to which Mr. King ascribes this invention.

From the *rude structure* of the arch in England, are we authorised to consider the arch itself of recent invention? The criterion of excellence in architecture is *durability*. Ornament is easily superadded. By exact execution, correct radii, or close union of solid parts, can *modern* builders rival the stability of *arches*, still enduring, *turned* by the *Romans* with ruder stones and wider interstices, but more adhesive mortar? Is the appropriate application of rough materials a proof of imperfect knowledge? We are precluded from discussing these interesting questions, and constrained to confess that the authorities which Mr. King has laboriously combined, are powerfully in favour of his decisions. Difficulties he thus surmounts:

'As to the celebrated *sewers of Rome*, which have been so often spoken of as being constructed by Tarquinius Superbus:—from the

very account which Dionysius Halicarnasseus, Strabo, and Pliny, give of them, as it stands in their own words, we may reasonably conclude, that the real work of Tarquin was, in some parts, mere excavation of rock ;—and in others, (where any thing like vaulting was needful,) formed of strong side walls, covered originally somewhat in the manner of the vaulting under the hanging gardens at Babylon ; or else merely with timber :—and that the whole was, after many ages, in the time of Augustus only, arched over by Agrippa.' Vol. ii. p. 269.

\* And that noble *dome*, the *Pantheon*, to have been built by Agrippa, the son-in-law of Augustus,—and the first great patron of arts, and of science.

\* Some persons indeed have conceived, that *the portico only* of the *Pantheon*, was built by Agrippa ;— and that the *dome* itself was of a *prior date*.—But for such conjecture, there is no other support than mere fancy : whilst the perfect silence of all preceding ages, concerning its existence, bears almost positive testimony to the contrary.—It is hardly possible to suppose, that so wonderful a structure as *this dome* should never have been mentioned, or taken the least notice of, *before* the time of Augustus, if it had really been in existence ; when so much was said in the Augustan age, and has been said ever since, concerning the wonderful boldness of the invention, and the marvellous execution of the design.

\* And as there is no good reason for conceiving the *Pantheon* to have existed before *that* age, so also, when all circumstances are duly considered, we must, I am persuaded, form exactly the same kind of conclusion, concerning the *Arco-felice* of brick, at *Cuma* ;—and even concerning the aqueduct of *Ancus-Martius*, notwithstanding the name it bears.

\* In short they appear every one of them, to have arisen, in their present *arched state*, nearly cœval with the *Pantheon* ;—with the *sepulchre* of *Augustus* himself ;—and with many arched, vaulted temples, in the neighbourhood of Rome,—all of which seem evidently to have been deemed, *in that age*, as structures of a kind both *novel* and *uncommon*.' Vol. ii. p. 270.

ROMAN WALLS, particularly those of *Antoninus* and *Severus*, with the line of march, '*military garb*,' and general appearance of *Roman soldiers* (from the representations on Trajan's Pillar), form the concluding subjects of the work.

Under *Roman protection*, the Britons, although they reverted to barbarism, improved in industry and civilisation. To *Roman invasion*, in itself unjustifiable, but salutary in its effects, Mr. King attributes the *overthrow* of *druidical superstition*, and the spreading of *the light of the Gospel*.

CASTRORUM IMPERIIS FUNCTI, we terminate a long campaign ; acknowledging that many enthusiastic appeals to religious feeling, fanciful allusions to scripture-history, unsupported conjectures, and distasteful repetitions, have been designedly overlooked. These defects are almost absorbed by genuine merits, penetrating research, solid learning, and, on the whole, rational deductions from accumulated facts.



**ART. III.**—*An Introduction to the Knowledge of rare and valuable Editions of the Greek and Latin Classics ; including Scriptores de Re Rustica, Greek Romances, and Lexicons and Grammars : to which is added a complete Index Analyticus. The whole preceded by an Account of the Polyglot Bibles, and the best Editions of the Greek Septuagint and Testament. By Thomas Frognall Dibdin, A. B. &c. 8vo. 12s. Boards. Dwyer. 1804.*

THE work which we are now called upon to notice, is the second of the kind that has been the produce of our soil. The advantage of them to the classical scholar is sufficiently obvious; and the rapid sale which the various editions of Harwood's work experienced, is a proof that English students have been sensible of their utility. But, notwithstanding the general usefulness of Dr. Harwood's *View of the Classics*, it laboured under some indisputable imperfections, that have frequently surprised us. Not to mention that many important and early editions of the Greek and Latin writers were omitted, the confused manner of arrangement certainly called for amendment. We mean not to disparage that performance: far from this, we feel grateful for what has been done: but the inconvenience which was produced by intermixing editions of the *fourteenth* with those of the *fifteenth*, *sixteenth*, and even *seventeenth* centuries, could not but be felt. As an instance of this, we may mention Homer. In the doctor's catalogue of the various editions of that poet, the *Iliad*, printed at Oxford in 1676, stands *first*, after which comes the *editio princeps* of 1488; even Barnes's edition of 1711 stands before those of the fifteenth century. We considered the manner also in which the respective authors were arranged, as objectionable. For, by placing them according to the æra in which they flourished instead of alphabetically, an index became necessary; and this, in the later editions of the work, was too full of errors to be of much use.

But if Dr. Harwood's performance had been less exceptionable than it really was, the many valuable editions of the classics which have been published since his time, rendered it desirable that some hand should supply his inevitable deficiencies. This has been undertaken by Mr. Dibdin. His views in the present work, together with the sources whence his information has been drawn, will be best explained by himself; and the modest manner, in which he speaks of his labours, cannot fail to secure to him the candour he requires.

\* My chief authorities' (says he) 'in the critical department are, Morhof, Le Long, Fabricius, Stollus, Ernesti, Masch, Harwood, Harles, and Marsh's *Michælis*: the *Prolegomena* of Mill and Wetstein, the *Bibliotheca Critica* published at Amsterdam, 1779, &c. and our own principal Reviews. To which may be added, the *Notitiæ Literariæ* of the *Bipont Classics*, hereafter noticed: these I have care-

fully consulted, considering them in general as the most interesting part of those editions. In order however that the present work might receive every advantage which I was capable of affording it, I perused the preface of Apollonius Rhodius by Beck; of Athenæus by Sweighæuser; of Cicero by Beck; of Diodorus Siculus by Eichstadt; of Eutropius by Verheyk; of Herodotus by Wesseling; of Homer by Heyne; of Horace by Mitscherlich and Doering; of Juvenal by Ruperti; of Lucretius by Wakefield and Eichstadt; of Cornelius Nepos by Staveren; of Petronius Arbiter by Antonius; of Pindar by Heyne; of Plutarch by Wyttenbach; of the Parma edition of Prudentius; of Quintilian by Spalding; of Tacitus by Oberlin; of Velleius Paterculus by Krause; of Virgil by Heyne (edit. 1788); and of the *Scriptores de Re Rustica* by Schneider: from these I have endeavoured to glean every thing which could enable me to estimate the real value of an edition.

‘ In the *bibliographical* and *typographical* department, I have had recourse to Mallinkrot, Chevillier, Maittaire, Wolfius, Clement, De Bure, Laire, Denis, Audiffredi, Panzer, and Renouard: to which authorities may be added occasional references to bibliographical dictionaries (French and English) and to public and private catalogues.’ Pref. p. vi.

---

‘ In perusing the following pages, it will be impossible for the reader not to discover errors and tautology; for the former, I can only solicit his indulgence, and express my thanks for the detection of such as have escaped me: (*‘quis posset*, says Aldus, in his preface to Strabo, *unquam vitare hanc communem tempestatem ac calamitatem librorum?*) the latter is probably unavoidable; as in referring to so many writers, whose sentiments are technically expressed, and consequently difficult to be cloathed in the English language, it is impossible to unite elegance with perspicuity.

‘ My object in this undertaking, however imperfectly effected, has been to promote the study of *bibliography*; and whatever success or failure may attend it, I shall feel happy in the reflection of having been the first to present my fellow-countrymen, in their own language, the testimony of some of the most distinguished foreign critics on the respective merits of the editions of the *Greek and Latin classics*.’ Pref. p. ix.

---

‘ Should my own publication be approved of, I may be induced to follow it up with a similar work, on the *remaining Greek and Latin writers* including the *fathers*: which may be succeeded by an account of the most curious and rare books in the *English and French languages*.’ P. xx.

The account of the editions of the chief classical writers which is now before us, receives no small addition in value and importance from the very copious and accurate information which is prefixed respecting the polyglot bibles, and the most esteemed editions of the sacred volumes. No less than six of the Septuagint (exclusive of that published by Dr. Holmes since

Harwood's time) and twenty-four of the New Testament, are added to the list of those mentioned in the doctor's 'View.' This part of the work deserves great praise for the industry and research which it exhibits; and we shall select Mr. Dibdin's observations on the celebrated Complutensian bible, as no unfavourable specimen of his performance. After having given us the title page at large, he thus proceeds.

'This is the celebrated Polyglot Bible, of which cardinal Ximenes was the promoter and patron: in order to become acquainted with the more learned parts of it, it is said he undertook to make himself master of the Hebrew tongue, though upwards of sixty years of age. He employed various learned men to compose it, and gave 4000 crowns for seven MSS. of the Hebrew Bible: the entire expense of this magnificent production, amounting to 50,000 ducats, was cheerfully defrayed by the liberality of the cardinal.

'The four first volumes comprehend the Septuagint: at the bottom of the Greek text is a Chaldee paraphrase with a Latin interpretation, and the margin is filled with Hebrew and Chaldee radicals. The fifth volume is an Hebrew and Chaldaic vocabulary of the Old Testament. The sixth volume forms the New Testament, in Greek, with a collateral Latin translation (the Vulgate): in the margin is a sort of concordance, referring to similar passages in other parts of the Old and New Testament. According to Clement (t. iv. 147) there are only two *marginal observations* in the New Testament; one relating to the omission of the doxology, the other to the insertion of the three witnesses in heaven — passages well known to the biblical student, and on which a great number of commentators have written with various ability and success.

'The Complutensian Polyglot was begun to be printed in 1502, was completed in 1517, but not published till 1522, owing to some doubts which were started by the church of Rome, whether it was proper to bring it into general circulation. See Masch, t. i. 195; and Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. ii. pt. i. 432. The bull of Pope Leo X. giving permission for the publication, was dated 22d March, 1520: the copies were not circulated till 1522.

'A great anxiety prevailed in the literary world to examine the *manuscripts* from which the Polyglot was composed. Professor Moldenhawer, who was in Spain in 1784, went to Alcala for the very purpose of discovering those MSS.; and there learnt, to his inexpressible chagrin, that about thirty-five years before they had been sold by an illiterate librarian, '*como membranas inutilis*,' to one *Toyro* a dealer in fireworks, for the purpose of making rockets! Martinez, a man of learning, and particularly skilled in the Greek language, heard of it soon after they were sold, and hastened to rescue these treasures from destruction: he arrived time enough to save a few scattered leaves! which are now preserved in the library at Alcala. 'Oh,' says Michaelis, 'that I had it in my power to immortalise both librarian and rocket maker!' — 'The author,' continues he, 'of this inexcusable act was the greatest barbarian of the present (18th) century, and happy only in being unknown.

'Of the intrinsic value of this work, Mills observes, speaking of

the New Testament: 'In grandi illo, nunquam satis celebrando opere Bibliorum Complutensium, &c. Optandum omnino esset, ut editio hæc magnifica, sicut omnium prima erat, ita sola quidem fuisset, cujus textus (demto uno et altero vitio supra memorato quæ in iteratâ proinde Bibliorum istorum editione sustulit Arius Montanus) integer et illibatus in editiones posteriores quasque transisset.' See Prolegom. (edit. Kuster.) sect. 1115. The opinion of Wetstein is not so favourable:—He says 'Hanc editionem Complutensem ejusque editorem tantum non in cælum tollunt laudibus.' And again, 'Denique si quis ea quæ hactenus proposuimus, ignorare malit, hoc saltem sciat, editionem Complutensem N. T. Græcam, omnium doctorum consensu depravatissimam judicari,' &c. See Prolegom. (edit. Semler) p. 310—16—17. It must however be remarked that according to Michaelis, Wetstein has inserted readings in his own edition of the New Testament which are generally found in the Complutensian edition; and which he preferred to the common text. 'He degrades it therefore,' says Michaelis, 'in words, but honours it in fact.'

'From the bull of Pope Leo X. affixed to the work, it appears that about 600 copies were struck off: a small number, exclaims Clement, and not sufficient for *public* libraries! Michaelis informs us, (vol. ii. pt. i. 442) that it is wanting in many of the public libraries in Germany, and was not, for many years, even in that of Gottingen: the copy in the Gottingen library cost 480 florins, and the late Münchhausen gave an order to his commissioner to bid as high as 900 florins. Goetze informs us that about fifteen copies are to be found in Germany. See Masch, t. i. 339, and the various authorities cited in note i: according to the preface of the Antwerp Polyglot, p. 26, it appears to have been rare even at the latter end of the sixteenth century.

'In our own country, a variety of copies may be traced besides those which are contained in public libraries. The Harleian copy, Bibl. Harl. vol. i. N° 1, was purchased of Osborne the bookseller, by the Rev. Cæsar de Missy for 42*l.*; and this very copy brought the same sum at the sale of de Missy's books in 1777, N° 388. At Dr. Mead's sale, N° 30, a fine copy was sold for 30*l.*; at the Crevenna sale, N° 1, for 370 florins; at the Pinelli, N° 4910, a damaged copy was sold for 25*l.* 14*s.*; at the late sale of Dr. Geddes's (March 1804) an imperfect copy was sold for 11*l.* 9*s.* The catalogues of Gaignat, duc de la Valliere, and Krohn, each contain a copy: I saw a fine one belonging to Messrs. Payne and Mackinlay, booksellers.

'Upon the whole, the Polyglot of cardinal Ximenes is a publication of great rarity and beauty; and its intrinsic excellence, considering the infantine period of biblical criticism when it was executed, redounds to the eternal honour of its patron. See the histories of Baudier, Flechier, and Marsollier, (the latter is the more modern one,) whose account of the university of Alcalá, the Polyglot Bible, and other literary projects suggested by the cardinal, is very interesting. The chief historian of Ximenes is Alvaro Gomez or Gomecius, whose work in one volume folio (Complut. 1569) is extremely rare: it was the basis of every subsequent history. In the year 1761, Vaughan translated the imperfect work of Baudier. Mallinkrot, p. 110, has given some account of this Polyglot; and a short sketch of it appears

in Mr. Butler's elegant and interesting work, *Horæ Biblicæ*, see p. 129, 7. Consult also Panzer, t. vi. 441—2; and Vogt, 92. In Bowyer's 'Origin of Printing' (p. 153) there is a long, ingenious but unfinished essay by the Rev. Cæsar de Missy on this Complutensian Polyglot: he thinks that it is *antedated*; but his reasons, besides being in contradiction to the united testimony of all historians, do not appear to be conclusive.<sup>2</sup> P. 1.

Every classical scholar will, we believe, join Michaelis in lamenting his inability to immortalise the librarian and rocket-maker above alluded to; and will think with us, that those persons were not less worthy to be handed down to posterity, whose ignorance, or inattention, in appointing so illiterate a fellow to so important a trust, was the mediate cause of this irreparable loss. The number of manuscripts thus destroyed has been supposed to be very great; for Moldenhawer, as quoted by Mr. Dibdin, says 'one Rodan assured Bowyer that he had seen the receipt which was given to the purchaser, from which it appeared that the money was paid at two different instalments.' Mr. Marsh has endeavoured to lessen the value of the MSS. by supposing them not to have been *vellum* but *paper* ones. His reason for this supposition is that rockets are not made with *vellum*. This however we think, with Mr. Dibdin, to be a very weak sort of argument, as it is by no means clear that *vellum* is a substance inapplicable to the purpose; and, besides, they were expressly designated as '*useless parchments*,' *membranas inutiles*. The other Polyglots of importance, noticed in the present work, are that of Antwerp, in 8 vols. folio 1569, that of Michael Le Joy printed at Paris in 10 vols. folio, ann. 1645, that of the justly celebrated Walton, printed at London in 6 vols. folio ann. 1657, and that of Leipsic, printed ann. 1750. These are the principal Polyglots. Mr. Dibdin indeed inserts among the number the *Lexicon Heptaglotton* printed at London ann. 1669. But though this be, as he justly observes, an indispensable companion of Walton's Polyglot, we cannot properly deem it a Polyglot *Bible*, as the latter word is now from long custom appropriated to the *sacred volumes*. In the account of the Parisian Polyglot, an interesting anecdote is given respecting the fate of the enterprising projector of that work (who fell a victim to the mortified pride of the ambitious Richelieu), which we are unwilling to withhold from our readers: it is as follows—

'The Parisian Polyglot was completed by the care and at the expense of *Michael Le Joy*; a name which cannot fail to strike the bibliographer with many singular reflections on the caprices of fortune, and on the unexpected and miserable fate of an enterprise which originally promised an abundant harvest of fame and profit to the editor.

'Cardinal *Richelieu*, whose name is so often connected with the



fine arts, watched the progress of this work with an anxious eye, and seemed, rightly perhaps, to think that nothing but his own name was wanting as its promoter and patron, to secure it both a rapid sale and extensive celebrity: *Richelieu's Polyglot* might probably have carried a charm with it which the humble name of Le Joy was unable to inspire. The artful cardinal first began to win the favour of Le Joy by throwing one Sionita (his rival and enemy) into prison: and then came forward with a magnificent offer of 100,000 crowns to defray the expenses of the publication, promising, at the same time, to take the editor and his family under his especial protection. These were splendid temptations, and nothing but more than stoical apathy, or unaccountable caprice, could have withstood them: Le Joy was not to be moved by prayers, promises, or entreaties, and the offer of the cardinal was rejected. 'Whether, says Le Long, he thought the sum inadequate to the value of the work, or meditated on obtaining an immense fortune by it; or whether intoxicated with its splendour, he was resolved to be the sole partaker of all the celebrity attached to it, the overtures of Richelieu were pertinaciously rejected.' Astonished at so unexpected an opposition, the cardinal employed all those wily and successful arts which he so ominently possessed, to depreciate a work he had before wished to patronise, and resolved that no means should be left untried by which the Polyglot of Le Joy might be brought into disrepute. He employed one Simeon de Muis, to write a tract which should point out its errors and imperfections; Muis readily complied, and in a composition of 500 pages was dexterous enough to discover a multiplicity of errors, which, had he been engaged on the other side of the question, he might have denominated beauties. The tract of Muis is said to be in the *Musæum Renaldinum*, and has never yet been published.

'When it was known that Muis, supported by such a patron, had attacked the Polyglot, a number of pamphleteers entered the lists against Le Joy, who was doomed to feel the bitter effects of so formidable an opposition. About this time the *English* booksellers offered to take 600 copies at half-price; but the pride of the editor was not yet sufficiently humbled to comply with so mortifying a proposal: the Polyglot therefore did not sell, and it is said a great number of copies were destroyed as waste paper.' P. VIIII.

Thus, by the artful villany of Richelieu, (such conduct deserves not a milder name) the praiseworthy and enterprising projector of this great work was brought to utter ruin. The motives, which induced Le Joy to refuse the offers of the cardinal we do not think it so difficult to account for as some have supposed. He probably expected, that, in the splendour of Richelieu's name, that of Le Joy would be swallowed up; and whilst the latter might be considered as the mere instrument of executing the project, the former would be esteemed not merely as the patron, but even as the framer of the design. Such a sacrifice he was unwilling to make, and was indisposed to run the hazard of exclaiming with the poet, *Sic vos non vobis*.....The policy of refusing the cardinal's invitation is another consideration.

It must be evident that such a work as Mr. Dibdin's it is im-

possible to analyse. A specimen of the manner in which it is executed will give a much more correct idea of its merits than could be conveyed by any thing which we can advance. In selecting such a specimen, we must confine ourselves to an author who has not appeared before the republic of letters in a great variety of forms, as being the only one that will suit the limits of our journal. This is certainly somewhat disadvantageous to Mr. Dibdin; since his diligence must most conspicuously appear in the enumeration of those among the classics, which have been given to the world in a great number of editions, as is the case with Virgil, Horace, and Cicero. Notwithstanding this circumstance, however, we hope to communicate a tolerably just opinion of what has been done in the present publication. In order to do so, we have extracted the following unabridged account of the different editions of Pindar.

#### ‘PINDARUS.

‘*Aldus. Venet. Oct. 1513. Sine scholiis.*

‘*Editio princeps: with the Hymns of Callimachus.* In the ‘Pythia,’ and ‘Nemea,’ Aldus appears to have consulted a much better MS. than in the ‘Olympia:’ in the Isthmia he has consulted an ancient, but very corrupt MS. The preface of this edition is extremely interesting: after giving a sketch of the war that ravaged Italy, and suspended his typographical labours, Aldus takes a review of what he has already done in the cause of literature, and meditates on his probable future efforts: from a part of this preface we learn that he had already exercised the art of printing twenty years, which proves that he began about 1493. Those who have not the original work may consult the preface as extracted by Maittaire, t. ii. 248. This is by no means a scarce edition; I saw a copy of it on vellum in lord Spencer’s library, which may be found in the *Bibl. Revickzk. Suppl.* 22\*. The Callimachus of this edition is very inaccurately reprinted from the ancient one mentioned at p. 67 *ante*. See *L’Imp. des Alde*, t. i. 97; Harles, *Fabr. B. G.* t. ii. 68.

‘*Calergi. Romæ. 4to. 1515. Gr. Cum scholiis.*

‘First edition with the scholia; which, however, is not much praised for its accuracy by Paul Stephens. In the Olympian, Nemean, and Isthmian poems, the readings are preferable to the Aldine; in the Pythian they are inferior. This edition, which is scarcer and dearer than the preceding one, formed along with it, the basis of many subsequent publications according to Heyne. *Edit. secund.* præf. p. 107.

‘*Ceporini. Basil. Oct. 1526–56. Gr. Cum scholiis.*

‘The first edition was published by Cratander, the second by his heirs. In the preface which is written by Zwinglius, there is an ingenious account of the life and merits of Pindar. At the end of the work there is an epistle in which Zwinglius bewails the premature death of Ceporinus (in December, 1525,) and gives a sketch of his

life and manners. Many passages of the Old and New Testament are illustrated by a reference to passages in Pindar. It is a most excellent edition formed on the preceding one of Calergus.

' In the edition of 1556, Dr. Askew wrote the following remark ; " Omnium editionum Pindari longe emendatissima est Cratandri editio." Dr. Harwood, and after him count Revickzky, says, this was written in the *first* edition : whether the *catalogue* be erroneous I know not, but the above sentence is distinctly printed after the second edition. See Bibl. Askev. N° 2695. The first edition is very rare and valuable ; Harles does not state the comparative excellence of the two ; Harwood calls the second " not so correct." See Harles *Introd. L. G. t. i.* 271 ; *Ibid. Fabr. B. G. t. ii.* 69.

' *Brubachius*. Francof. 4to. 1542. Gr. *Cum scholiis*.

' An indifferent edition founded on Calergus's : in the margin there are various readings from the Aldine edition.

' *Morel*. Paris. 4to. 1558. Gr. *Sine scholiis*.

' A beautiful and excellent edition founded on Brubachius's, and probably edited as well as printed by William Morel. Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc. t. i.* 555, mentions a Parisian edition of this date, *cum schol.*\*, which I conceive to be erroneous ; as from a careful investigation of Maittaire, in *Vit. Steph. et Typog. Parisiens.* I find no other Parisian edition of Pindar but the one published by H. Stephens. Mr. White in his Cat. of 1801, N° 3570, mentions a quarto Greek edition of 1558 by Stephens, which date is discountenanced by Chevillier and Maittaire. See Maittaire, *t. iii.* 706-9. A beautiful copy of the above edition, by Morel, was sold at Mr. Bridges's sale for 1*l.* 6*s.* ; at Dr. Mead's, N° 2005, for 2*l.* 2*s.* ; at Dr. Askew's, N° 2604, it was purchased by Mr. Mason for 1*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* See Bibl. Revickzk. *p.* 12 ; Harles *Fabr. B. G. t. ii.* 69.

' *H. Stephanus*. Paris. Oct. 1560-66-86. 2 vol.

' These Greek and Latin editions contain the poems of Pindar, with those of Alcæus, Sappho, Stesichoras, Ibycus, Anacreon, Bacchylides, Simonides, and Alcmanes : the edition of Morel, and the scholia of Ceporinus's edition, are chiefly followed. The third edit. of 1586 contains some notes from a MS. of Casaubon, which were not reprinted by subsequent editors. Of the editions of Stephens, that of 1560 is the most correct.

' Paul Stephens published three editions at Geneva ; namely in 1600, 1612, 1626 : they are taken from Stephens's and contain nothing entitled to particular notice. Plantin published an edition in 1567, after the first of Stephens's, which is called by Harwood " beautiful and correct." Consult Harles, *Fabr. B. G. t. ii.* 70 ; *Ibid. Introd. L. G. t. i.* 272.

' *Schmidii*. Witteberg. 4to. 1616. Gr. et Lat. *Cum schol.*

' Heyne, in the preface to his quarto edition, has, with great temper and judgement, pointed out some of the errors and absurdities of this work, especially in those parts relating to the " *ratio metrica* : " yet is Schmid called by him " *editorum Pindari facile princeps* !"

\* Harles is incorrect in saying Fabricius supposed this scholia edition to have been printed by Morel ; Fabricius under the scholia editions simply says, " Paris, 4to. 1558." He afterwards distinctly specifies Morel's edition under those " *sine scholiis*, Gr."

This editor has undoubtedly performed a valuable service to his author, by having examined three MSS. in the Palatine library, and inserted some fragments from the *Biblioth. Augustina*, collated by Hæschelius in the text of the "Olympia and Pythia." The text contains many valuable readings from ancient works, and various passages of the poet are explained in a sagacious and successful manner: it is allowed to be a more erudite edition than either of the preceding. Schmid published a specimen of it in 1611, 4to. See Harles, *Fabr. B. G. t. ii.* 71—2; *Ibid. Introd. L. G. t. i.* 272. The copies on large paper are rare, and much sought after.

' *Benedicti*. Salmurii, 4to. 1620, Gr. et Lat.

' Schmid's edition is chiefly followed; but Benedict is allowed by scholars to have given a more correct and valuable one.

' *Westii et Wcltedii*, Oxon. fol. 1697, Gr. et Lat.

' This beautiful and celebrated edition is formed on that of Schmid, adopting its version, and the arguments and annotations of Benedict. It contains the readings of five MSS. in the Bodleian library, not, however, of any particular importance; it has also a multitude of other readings which were collected chiefly by Schmid. Of this edition Heyne observes, "Modestiam et æquitatem virorum facile probes; etiamsi doctrinæ subtilitatem, criticum, acutum, et subactum in admittendis vel rejiciendis interpretationibus et lectionibus æstimandis desideres ingenium." *Darwes*, in *Miscell. Crit. sect. ii.* p. 37.68 (ed. 1781), has given "Oxoniensium Pindari editorum desideratæ anxietatis specimen," which the reader is requested to consult, with the Appendix of Burgess, p. 353. Upon the whole, we must allow that the editors of this magnificent work have taken infinite pains to bring together every thing which could illustrate and improve the reading of the poet; and notwithstanding they have since been eclipsed by the taste and erudition of Heyne, their edition will long remain a splendid monument of classical research and typographical beauty.

' The large paper copies of this work which were unknown to De Bure, are extremely rare, and bring a very great price. A copy is in *Bibl. Bridges.* p. 208; at Dr. Askew's sale, N° 2651, a most sumptuous copy was sold for 14*l.* 10*s.* Lord Spencer is in possession of a copy from *Bibl. Revickzk. Suppl.* p. 16. Mr. Faulder, in his Catalogue of 1797, N° 755, marked a copy in vellum binding at 21*l.* A copy is in Mr. White's Catalogue, 1801, N° 11096, without price. It is curious enough that two copies of this edition of Pindar, in the year 1704 (seven years after its publication), were sold for 10*s.* and 12*s.* at the sale of a Mr. Humphryes's library at Oxford.

' *Fowlis*, Glasgux, duod. 1744-54-70, 3 vols.

' Of the first of these Greek and Latin editions Harwood observes—"I have carefully read this edition twice through, and affirm it to be one of the most accurate of the Glasgow editions of the Greek classics." The edition of 1770 is not so correct, according to Harles.

' *Bowyer* edited and printed a very elegant and correct little edition in 1755, Greek and Latin; the Latin version is from the Oxford edition of 1694: it is now scarce. The reputation of this learned

printer had long made all his classical publications rare. This edition is slightly mentioned in Nichols's *Life of Bowyer*, p. 259.

\* *Heynii*, Gottingen, 4to. 1773-4, Gr. et Lat. 2 vol.

\* *Ibid.* *Ibid.* 8vo. 1798, Gr. et Lat. 3 vol.

\* The first edition by this celebrated scholar and critic, was highly treasured by the learned world\*. The great judgement displayed in the choice of the text and its punctuation, the various readings, and the care with which all former editions appeared to have been consulted, rendered it a performance far exceeding all previous publications. "In the preface, (says Harles) all the fountains and rivulets of Pindaric literature, are laid open with the utmost beauty and perfection." The second volume contains a critical account of MSS. and editions (which Harles has almost invariably copied), and the Latin version of Koppius, corrected by Heyne. In the catalogue of count Reviczky, page 13, there is described to be a large paper copy of these two volumes on *fine vellum paper*, which was given to the count by Heyne himself: I consider it, says he, as the most beautiful production which has issued for some time past from the German press! This valuable copy is now in the library of lord Spencer.

\* In the year 1791 Heyne published "*Additamenta ad Lectionis varietatem in Pindari Carminum Editione*, Gotting. 1773, notatam ab editore C. H. Heyne."

\* In the year 1798 Heyne brought out his second edition of Pindar, which far surpasses the first, great as its merits undoubtedly are! It is published in three thick volumes, which would be better divided into six, as the two last volumes have each *two distinct parts*. This edition has received many valuable acquisitions, not only from the professor's enlarged knowledge of the poet†, but from the Pindari *Fragmenta* of Schneider‡, the work of Misigarelli, and the "*De Pindari Metris*," et "*De Metris Græcorum*," of Hermannus. The first volume contains the entire text of Pindar, under which are the copious notes of Heyne and others. The first part of the second volume contains the Latin version with the Scholia in Olympia; second part of the second volume, the Scholia on the remaining poems. The first part of the third volume contains the valuable Pindaric Fragments of Schneider, corrected by Heyne, about which the professor seems to have been particularly anxious (see pref. p. xx.): the second part of the third volume has *three indexes* of words, proper names, and the most memorable writers of the Scholia: the

\* "I have read this edition of Pindar," (says Harwood) "and it possesseth singular merit: I can pronounce it by far the best edition of Pindar. The Greek type is singularly beautiful. My friend Dr. Lowth, the late worthy and learned bishop of London, once showed me a copy of this edition on *writing-paper*, and I think it was one of the most elegant books I ever saw."

† Heyne, in the first page of his preface, thus modestly speaks of the comparative merits of his two editions—"Consequutus eram operâ meâ, quod volebam, ut in promptu essent exemplaria ad schôlas interpretando Pindaro habendas, atque studium Pindari inter nostrates accenderetur. Interpretatus sum sum aliquoties; quoties autem novas lectiones instituerem, videbam multa quidem me nondum satis intelligere, incidebam nec minus in loca, in quibus sentiebam, ipsum me antea nihil intellexisse, aut parum acute vidisse."

‡ Argent. 4to. 1776.



whole of which was compiled by a learned young man of the name of *Fiorello*. The indexes are followed by an epistle of *Hermannus* to *Heyne*, concerning the rhythms of *Pindar*.

'After an edition so full, correct, and profoundly learned as this second\* one of professor *Heyne*, the public perhaps cannot expect much farther elucidation of the sublime strains of *Pindar*. There are some *fine paper copies* of this work which I would recommend the student to procure, if he is anxious to make marginal notes, as the common paper copies are very wretchedly printed: those on fine paper sell for one guinea more than the common ones.' p. 286.

Of Mr. *Dibdin's* performance we entertain a very favourable opinion; but, in a work of such a nature, some mistakes will slip from the most careful pen; and we trust to Mr. *Dibdin's* candor for a favourable acceptance of what we shall offer to his consideration on this subject. Speaking of the *Herodotus* published by *Borheck*, he says,

'The first volume contains the Greek text of *Reizius*; the second the *Latin version* and commentaries of *Gattererus*, 'de ordine et concilio *Herodoti*,' originally written in German, in *Cathol. Biblioth. Harles. Introd. L. G. t. i.* 289.' p. 156.

This description of *Borheck's* publication, taken from *Harles*, contains almost as many errors as words. The text (with the exception of a small portion of it) is *not* taken from *Reitzius*, the first volume does *not* contain the Greek text. The second volume does *not* contain the *Latin version* and commentaries of *Gattererus*. The fact is, *the first volume contains the first five books of the history, together with that part of the commentaries of Gatterus which relates to them. The second contains the remaining books, the remainder of the commentary, the Fragments of Ctesias, and the Life of Homer. No Latin version is annexed to it, nor does it appear to have been Borheck's intention to publish any. As to the Greek text, Reitzius is followed in the first four books only; they were all that Reitzius had then published. Borheck's own words are, 'Horum (i. e. Herodoti et Ctesiae) contexta e Petri Wesselengii editione Amstelodami, 1763—vulgatâ repetii; is enim vir longè eruditissimus hos optime recensuit auctores. In quatuor tamen libris Herodoti prioribus clarissimi viri Reitzii novissimam recensionem, Lipsiæ editam, in auxilium quoque vocavi, plurimasque ex hac interpunctiones verborum retinui.'* Præf. vol. i. p. vi. Of the value of the work neither *Harles* nor Mr. *Dibdin* speaks: we will therefore add that it is most wretchedly printed, on most wretched paper; and that, notwithstanding the care which was taken, as *Borheck* assures

---

\* \* In the years 1792—5, *Beck* published two volumes of his edition of *Pindar*, including only the three first poems. In his preface, p. 19, *Heyne* speaks of having followed *Beck* in the *Scholia*, though with considerable corrections, chiefly from a valuable MS. at *Gottingen*.'

us, in correcting the press, a very considerable number of errors are to be found in the text.

Harles, whom Mr. Dibdin has implicitly followed in the above account, is not always to be depended upon. He had partialities which often warped his judgement, and rendered him blind to the failings of some, and the merits of others. Nothing but fond friendship or gross flattery could have induced him to speak of Reiske, who was a bold, rash, and sometimes injudicious critic, in the high strain of panegyric that he has done; and nothing but the most unscholar-like prejudice could have prompted him, in conjunction with Reiske, to pronounce Taylor, the celebrated editor of Demosthenes, 'in sagacity, sound criticism, and Latin composition, not comparable to Wolf.' Reiske was particularly inveterate against English scholars, and, 'with his usual liberality towards English editors' (as Mr. Dibdin justly observes), 'has severely attacked Taylor and Markland, and called the latter a *clergyman*, from his frequent references to St. Paul's epistles.' Our countrymen indeed have experienced but scurvy treatment from foreigners. One gentleman\*, whose work was noticed in a former number of our journal, silently attempts to rob us of all claim to mathematical knowledge; another depreciates the talents of our ablest critics; and a third† will not allow us to know the quantity of a Greek word.

But to return to Mr. Dibdin; he is, we apprehend, incorrect also in his account of Tyrwhitt's Aristotle. 'This edition,' (says Mr. Dibdin) 'was superintended in the publication by Dr Burgess, a luminous scholar. It has an Index, and the *Latin version of Goulston corrected*: the text is not formed on any particular edition, but adopted according to the judgement of Tyrwhitt.' The truth is, this work was not superintended by Dr. Burgess *alone*; but several distinguished scholars of the university were associated with him, who, in some instances, acted against the opinion of Dr. Burgess in the mode of conducting the publication. This, if our memory do not deceive us, has been stated by the bishop himself in one of his fasciculi. With respect to the Latin version, it cannot, with any propriety, be called that of Goulstone, his being very paraphrastic, whilst that of Tyrwhitt is very close. The translation is Tyrwhitt's own. We are very much mistaken also, if this edition of Aristotle's Poetics did not appear in *quarto* as well as *octavo*, and that too in a very sumptuous manner. We are almost inclined to think that it is no other than the *quarto* impression, which, according to Mr. Dibdin, has been ascribed to Dr. Randolph. The work we allude to, and which we are

---

\* Bossut. See Crit. Rev. vol. i. p. 131, Third Series.

† Hermannus. See our critiques on the Oxford edition of Homer.

disposed to think is the quarto edition of Tyrwhitt's Aristotle, is thus characterised by Mr. Dibdin—'Ox. 4to. 1794\*.' This is one of the most splendid and beautiful works that ever issued from the Clarendon press. The editor's name is not affixed to it; but report assigns it to Dr. *Randolph*, the present bishop of Oxford. Some very few copies were magnificently struck off on large paper.' Mr. Dibdin is also mistaken (if Tyrwhitt be to be credited) in ascribing to Goulston an edition of the Poetics; according to that critic, he published *his Latin version only*. The manner too in which he speaks of the second edition of Shutz's *Æschylus*, leads us to think he is not aware that Mr. Porson's different readings, as they appeared in the Glasgow edition, are inserted as an appendix in the third volume of Shutz's first edition. We will moreover take the liberty of hinting, that, in enumerating the different editions of Epictetus, Mr. Dibdin ought to have distinguished between those which contain the *Enchiridion only*, and those which include Arian's Discourses as well. We think likewise that Mr. Dibdin has sometimes been too lavish of his praise. Where did he learn that *Taylor's translation of Plato* was a work of celebrity? It was just wet from the press when Mr. Dibdin's performance was sent there; and could not at that time have been either celebrated or otherwise. Since that time, we have had occasion to examine it, and have borne our testimony to its meanness and absurdity. We have not seen the Lexicon edited by that gentleman, and therefore cannot determine as to its *copiousness or value*; we have great doubts, however, of its deserving that character. We will further beg leave to suggest to Mr. Dibdin that he would have more completely fulfilled the design mentioned by him in his preface, 'that of presenting to his fellow countrymen, in their *own language*, the testimony of some of the most distinguished foreign critics,' if he had taken the trouble always to translate their remarks; which is frequently not done. Blemishes, however, of the kind which we have noticed, do not appear to us to be numerous in the work before us; neither are they of such importance as to lessen, in any considerable degree, the value of Mr. Dibdin's labours. We can, with strict propriety, recommend his volume to the classical student; and we hope he will find sufficient patronage to encourage him to give a second, comprising such Greek and Latin writers as are omitted in the one of which we now take our leave.

---

\* Tyrwhitt's 8vo. ed. appeared also in 1794. REV.

ART. IV.—*Sir Tristrem; a metrical Romance of the thirteenth Century; by Thomas of Ercildoune, called the Rhymor. Edited from the Auchinleck MS. By Walter Scott, Esq. 8vo. 11. 1s. Boards. Longman and Rees. 1804.*

MONTFAUCON, in a catalogue of manuscripts now transferred to the library at the Louvre, enumerates cod. 6776. *Le Roman de Tristan et Iseult, traduit de Latin en François par Lucas, Chevalier et Sieur du Chatel du Gast pres de Salisberi, Anglois; avec figures.* This translation, by Lucas of Salisbury into Norman-French, of the story of Sir Tristan, must have been in continental circulation before the year 1225; as in the *Poésies du Roi de Navarre*, written in that or the following year, mention is made of the romance in these words:

‘ De mon penser aime mieux sa compaignie  
Qu’onques Tristan ne fit Iseul s’amie.’

We suspect this to be the source of the versified romance ascribed to Chretien de Troyes. The introduction, at least, must be prior to the year 1191; for it addresses Philip count of Flanders, who died in that year: yet it is unlikely to have preceded the year 1189, in which the news arrived of the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin, because a crusade to deliver Jerusalem is proposed to the hero by his king. The composition therefore may, with considerable confidence, be referred to the year 1190. It is, no doubt, one of those romances which Richard Lion-heart, who possessed a well known taste for tales of chivalry, called into being. The residence of the English author, so near the palace of Clarendon, increases the probability of his pursuing the patronage of this prince. The work was translated into German verse by Godfrey of Strasburg in 1250.

Lucas of Salisbury was favourably situated for deriving information from Welsh sources. He is indeed stated to have translated his Tristan from the Latin\*. But he may have been supplied with his Latin text by some Welsh ecclesiastic of the neighbourhood, or by some living bard of Rhees ap Gryffyth, the host and guest of Henry II. The scene of the adventures is laid in Cornwall and in Brittany, where the Armorican dialect prevailed. The proper names occurring in the romance are chiefly Welsh. Trystan, in that language, signifies *the tumultuous*. He was, according to the bards, the son of Tallwz, a chieftain of the sixth century, and rich in hogs. In the Triads

---

\* Q. Was not Latin used for metre, or verse, in the twelfth century? Attend to the following passage in the preface to a romance of the year 1200, concerning Charlemagne. ‘ Baudoin, comte de Hainault, trouva à Sens, en Bourgogne, la Vie de Charlemayne: et mourant la donna à sa sœur Ylond, qui m’a prie que je la mette en roman sans rime: parce que tel se delitera el roman qui del Latin n’ont cure; et parce que le roman sera mieux gardé.’

he is ranked with Greidiol and Gwgon, as one of the three famous heralds of Britain, and surpassing in the knowledge of the laws of war. Trystan, Gwair, and Kai, were called the three diademed princes. Trystan, Caswallon, and Kynan, were called the three faithful lovers. This last epithet still clings to his name in consequence of his passion for the wife of Mark Meirzion his uncle, Essylt (or Iseult) the heroine of the romance. The subordinate names, too, are of genuine British origin; as Morgan, Roland Riis, Urgan (Urien), Brengwain, Ganhardin, Beliagog. The few French names, such as Blanchefleur, are, no doubt, translations of harsh Welsh sounds. All the phenomena conspire to point out the Mabinogion, or native romances of Wales, as the nest of this celebrated story.

Thomas of Ercildoune, the rhymers of the poem here edited, was in the zenith of his reputation in 1286. He flourished later by a century than the author, and by half a century than the German translator, of this romance. He is supposed by his editor (p. xxxix) to have derived the materials of his work from the Strathclywd Britons. In this case no French names would occur in his vernacular version. Instead of Blanchefleur we should find Gwenblaendardd. But the few Frenchified names of Lucas are all preserved, Gouvernail, Triamour, Florentin. It follows that he is refashioning not the British or Cimbric original, but the Norman version. Robert of Brunne was no admirer of the liberties taken by Thomas of Ercildoune with his model.

‘I see in song in sedgeyng tale  
Of Erceldoune and Kendale;  
None them sayes as they them wrought,  
And in ther saying it semes nought;  
That may thou here in Sir Tristram.’

Sir Trystan (the Welsh spelling of his name seems entitled to the preference), as far as we can learn, is, in point of time, the first of all the numerous story-books about the knights of the round table, and the companions of Arthur. Its history is likely to be the history of the whole class. It derives clearly from a Welsh source. By Norman romancers attached to the British princes, it was found up in England, translated into prose and verse, and thus handed over to the continent. Sir Lancelot \* of the Lake, said to have been translated at the com-

---

\* Galland attributes to Wace of Jersey, who composed in 1160 the *Roman de Rou et des Ducs de Normandie*, the fabulous History of Sir Ywaine, or the *Chevalier du Lion*. Wace, in the *Roman de Rou*, says that king Henry the Second allowed him a pension, but that else he could not afford to translate: this pension was a prebendal stall at Bayeux.

Livres ecrire et translater,  
Ne treiz gaise qui rien me dont;  
Fors le roi Henri le second



mand of Henry the Second by Robert Browne, may, however, dispute with Sir Trystan the prize of antiquity: it is to be wished that it were edited in its oldest English form with all the obtainable illustrations. It is not improbable that, at the celebrated carousal given at Aberteivi in 1176, by Rhees the gallant and accomplished prince of Gwyneth, were first published to the English the exploits of Arthur. 'Among deeds of arms and other shows, (says Powell) Rhees caused all the poets of Wales to come thither, and provided chairs for them to be set in his hall, where they should dispute together to try their cunning and gift in their several faculties; and great rewards and rich gifts were appointed for the overcomers.' This Rhees of the Welsh deserves to rank with the Berenguiers, counts of Barcelona, for his critical, useful, and decisive influence on the revival of poetic literature, by the fashion which his taste, and the leisure which his patronage, bestowed on the bards. To this period of Welsh culture must be ascribed many of those compilations, which profess to contain the poems of the bards of Arthur.

From whatever quarter we derive the romances of chivalry, it is highly desirable that they should speedily be snatched from the precarious custody of mouldering manuscripts, and perpetuated by the printing-press. The philologist, the poet, and the antiquary have much, the historian, the statesman, and the philosopher have some, profit to expect from attending to these infantine lisplings of the epic Muse. They serve to endear by association those indigenous spots and ancient halls, the supposed scenes of celebrated event. They respect the stock of fablery, out of which may best be derived the substance of future epopeias. They illustrate the manners of remote ages, record the intermarriages of eminent families, and attach pedigrees, as it were, to the gods. They nourish and preserve a complacency in courage, generosity, independence; and, by aggrandising our forefathers, invigorate our own emulation.

Those romances of chivalry which concern Charlemaigne and his twelve peers, may reasonably be left to the care of French antiquaries. But those which respect British champions, such as Arthur and his knights, Guy of Warwick, Bevis of Southampton, Harold of Arden, ought surely to find a British editor. We should think it most advisable to reprint at full length the ancient poems, provided with the requisite interpretation or glossary, and enlivened by numerous notes, such as those here attached to the several cantos of *Sir Tristrem*. We feel grateful to Mr. Scott for having set the example of so in-

---

Me fit donner, Dieu li rende,  
A Baieus une provende.

See Brequigny's Analysis of the Roman de Rou, contained in the fifth volume of the *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Paris, an VII.

teresting a republication, and for having set it so well. The attention with which this book is executed does much honour to his erudition, his industry, and his taste. A preliminary dissertation compiles very curious particulars, (1) of the poet, (2) of the romance, and (3) of the manuscript he protects. We have already given, however, on some of the points in discussion, especially those of the second subdivision, intimations of a different opinion.

A conclusion, abridged from the French metrical romance, is supplied both in prose and rime by the ambidexterity of Mr. Scott's pen. The modern stanzas very completely and happily imitate the form and manner of the old poem: they run thus.

‘ The companions fiftene,  
To death did thai thringe;  
And sterveth bidene,  
Tho Tristrem the yinge;  
Ac Tristrem hath tene,  
His wounde gan him wring,  
To hostel he hath gene,  
On bedde gan him flinge  
In ure;  
Fele salven thai bringe,  
His paine to recure.

‘ But never thai no might,  
With coste, nor with payn,  
Bring Tristrem the wight,  
To heildom ogayn:  
His wounde brast aplight,  
And blake was the bane;  
Non help may that knight,  
The sothe for to sayne,  
Bidene,  
Säve Ysonde the bright,  
Of Cornwal was quene.

‘ Tristrem clepeth aye,  
On Ganhardin trewe fere;  
—“ Holp me; brother, thou may,  
And bring me out of care;  
To Ysonde the gaye,  
Of Cornwail do thou fare;  
In tokening I say,  
Mi ring with the thou bare,  
In dern;  
Bot help me sche dare,  
Sterven wol ich gern.

“ Mi schip do thou take,  
With godes that bethe new;  
Tuo seyles do thou make,  
Beth different in hew;

That tone schall be blake,  
That tother white so snewe;  
And tho thou comest bake  
That tokening schal schew  
The end,  
Gif Ysonde me forsake,  
The blake schalt thou bende."—

‘ Ysonde of Britanye,  
With the white honde,  
In dern can sche be,  
And wele understonde,  
That Ysonde the fre,  
Was sent for from Inglonde.  
—“ Y-wroken wol Y be  
Of mi fals husbonde  
Saunfayle,  
Bringeth he haggards to honde,  
And maketh me his stale? ”—

‘ Ganhardin to Inglonde fares,  
Als merchaunt, Y you saye;  
He bringeth riche wares  
And garmentes were gaye;  
Mark he giftes bares,  
Als man that miche maye,  
A cup he prepares,  
The ring tharein can laye,  
Bidene;  
Brengrwain the gaye,  
Y-raught it the quene.

‘ Ysonde the ring knewe,  
That riche was of gold,  
As tokening trewe,  
That Tristrem her yold;  
Ganhardin gan schewe,  
And pririliche hir told,  
That Tristrem hurt was newe,  
In his wounde that was old,  
Al right:  
Holp him gif sche nold  
Sterven most that knight.

‘ Wo was Ysonde than,  
The tale tho sche hard thare,  
Sche schope hir as a man,  
With Ganhardin to fare;  
O bord are thai gan,  
A wind at wil thame bare;  
Ysonde was sad woman,  
And wepeth bitter tare,  
With eighe:  
The seyls that white ware,  
Ganhardin lete fleighe.

- \* Ysonde of Britanye,  
 With the white honde,  
 The schip sche can se,  
 Seyling to londe;  
 The white seyl tho marked sche,  
 —“ Yonder cometh Ysonde,  
 For to reve fro me,  
 Miin fals husbonde;  
 Ich sware,  
 For il tho it schal be,  
 That sche hir hider bare.”—
- \* To Tristrem sche gan hye,  
 O bed thare he layne,  
 —“ Tristrem, so mot Ich thye,  
 Heled schalt thou bene,  
 Thi schippe I can espye  
 The sothe for to sain,  
 Ganhardin is comen neighe,  
 To curen thi paine,  
 Aplight.”—  
 —“ What seyl doth thare flain,  
 Dame, for God almight?”—
- \* Sche weneth to ben awrake,  
 Of Tristrem the trewe,  
 Sche seyth—“ thai ben blake,  
 As piche is thare hewe.”—  
 Tristrem threw hym bake,  
 Trewd Ysonde untrewed,  
 His kind hert it brake,  
 And sindrid in tuo;  
 Above,  
 Cristes merci him take!  
 He dyed for true love.
- \* Murneth olde and yinge,  
 Murneth lowe and heighe,  
 For Tristrem, swete thinge,  
 Was mani wate eighe;  
 Maidens thare hondes wringe,  
 Wives iammeren and crii;  
 The belles con thai ring,  
 And masses con thai seye,  
 For dole;  
 Prestes praied aye,  
 For Tristremes sole.
- \* Ysonde to land wan,  
 With seyl and with ore;  
 Sche mete an old man,  
 Of berd that was hore:  
 Fast the teres ran,  
 And siked he sore,  
 —“ Gone is he than,

Of Ingland the flore,  
In lede;  
We se him no more:  
Schir Tristrem is dede!"—

' When Ysonde herd that,  
Fast sche gan to gonne,  
At the castel gate  
Stop hir might none:  
Sche passed in thereat,  
The chaumbre sche won;  
Tristrem in cloth of stat  
Lay stretched thare as ston  
So cold—  
Ysonde loked him on,  
And faste gan bihold.

' Fairer ladye ere  
Did Britannye never spyē,  
Swiche murning chere,  
Making on heighe:  
On Tristremes bere,  
Doun con sche lye;  
Rise ogayn did sche nere,  
But thare con sche dye  
For woe:—  
Swiche lovers als thei  
Never schal be moe.' p. 193.

To the poem, which, as the reader will perceive, is not very intelligible, a sufficient glossary has been provided; and elucidatory notes have been appended, which are drawn up with propriety and research, but which might more conveniently have been arranged at the end of the several cantos. An abstract of two ancient fragments of French metrical romances on the subject of Sir Trystan, existing in Mr. Douce's manuscript, also occurs: it was communicated by Mr. George Ellis, the hope of poetic archæology.

There is an anonymous Italian poem, entitled *Inamoramento di Tristano ed Isotta*, printed in 1526, and probably written by Marco Guazzo, which is the only attempt we recollect to modernise this favourite story of our ancestors. It will not recover its ancient popularity: our correcter notions of the importance and duty of conjugal fidelity will prevent Essylt (for such is her original and Welsh name) from ever becoming a favourite heroine. The vulgar disguises of Trystan, however diverting to a coarse and rude age, would in these times appear to degrade the hero. At most, in the comic style of *La Fontaine* could the story now be told with effect: yet it was one of the earliest and most popular of romance-books: it is quoted in the *Amadis*, as the delight of princesses; and has, no doubt,



contributed frequently to inspire that rotatory cupidity which infected even the daughters of Charlemagne.

This volume, though good, is too dear: it exposes the concerned to a suspicion of rapacity: it retards the diffusion of a taste for the metrical romances of chivalry.

ART. V.—*Three Tracts on the Syntax and Pronunciation of the Hebrew Tongue; with an Appendix, addressed to the Hebrew Nation. By Granville Sharp. 12mo. 7s. Boards. Verner and Hood. 1804.*

THE benevolent and indefatigable author of this work is too well known to the world from his former publications, to require any panegyric from us on his character or his writings. We shall therefore, without further introduction, advert to the contents of this letter, the subject of which has been hitherto considered as of peculiar difficulty, and, when regarded as an anomaly, one of the most inexplicable that occurs. That a conjunction copulative should have the effect of changing the verb it introduces from *preterite* to *future*, and *vice versâ*, appears, at first view, a solecism not to be explained; and certain it is, that the many grammarians who have hitherto attempted to explain it, have not been altogether successful. Whether Mr. Sharp be more fortunate, remains to be shown. Let us attend to what he has advanced.

Having begun with stating the rules laid down by Buxtorf in his *Thesaurus Grammaticus Lingua sanctæ Hebrææ*, as also those of Schickard, Sanctus Pagninus, and Bythner, who have no better means of indicating the conversive *ו*, than an arbitrary assignation of points; and proceeded to show that the distinctions of Masclef, Grey, and Gregory Sharp, by whom the Masoretic points were discarded, are not determinate, any more than those in the Grammar printed for Terry\*;—Mr. Sharp refers his readers to the only sentence he had hitherto found in any of the grammarians, which had the appearance of leading him towards the proper research. This

\* is in p. 598, of the learned John Buxtorf's "*Thesaurus Grammaticus Lingua sanctæ Hebrææ*," before cited. "*How therefore*" (says he) "*shall it be known, when it is simply a COPULATIVE, or when it is also CONVERSIVE? Elias replies*" (continues he) "*in the book Hababachur Orat. sect. 5, 'If another PRÆTERPERFECT tense shall have gone before (or a FUTURE tense put for a PRÆTER TENSE)' [he must*

\* This grammar was drawn up either by Dr. DODDERIDGE, or his successor Dr. ASHWORTE, but, it is commonly understood, by the latter. It was the grammar used by his pupils at Daventry, and, as we are informed by a gentleman educated under him, was there considered as his. He, at least, first printed it at the Oxford press.

mean, I suppose, by having also a *ו* prefixed to it] “then it is *COPULATIVE*, if otherwise it shall be deemed *CONVERSIVE*; as *מי פעל ועשה* Who hath wrought and done? Isai. xli. 4. Therefore” (says he) “he must look where he should begin the sentence, or [where] he should join word to word, or sentence to sentence.” P. 9.

But this rule, whatever light it may afford, being after all incomplete, as Mr. Sharp shows in his remarks upon it, he proceeds on to add, that

“The only useful hint, then, that a learner can borrow from Rabbi Elias, is that “he must look where he should begin the sentence, and [where] he should join word to word, and sentence to sentence.” P. 11.

Yet, even for this, he has given no *general rule*.—Mr. Sharp, as necessary to the understanding of his own rules, introduces it with the following remarks.

“1st,—That the verses of the *Hebrew Scriptures*, from period to period, do frequently contain *more sentences than one*, sometimes even two or three sentences.

“And 2dly,—That sometimes, on the contrary, one sentence, *paragraph*, or *sentiment*, is obviously extended throughout several adjoining verses.

“For, respecting the 1st, we have sometimes a narrative, explaining the occasion of a particular *command*, *law*, or *speech*, or occasional speeches and their answers or effects, with the connecting narrative between them, each of which must be deemed a *separate sentence*; for even the connecting narrative after a speech is the commencement of a *new sentence*; so that several different sentences are frequently contained in one verse.

“And respecting the second consideration, on the contrary part, it is equally obvious, that sometimes the connection of the sense of the narrative or speech, extends *through several verses*, so as to form but *one entire sentence*.

“This is not to be attributed to any want of *regularity* in the *Hebrew tongue*; but on the contrary, to a peculiar *accuracy of expression* in the idiom of the language, of which, it is probable, the Rabbi Elias was sufficiently aware, though he *has not* explained it; but it will be rendered perfectly familiar to the meanest capacity by the examples of the following rules, respecting *ו conversive*; and therefore I have only to request my readers, carefully to follow Rabbi Elias’s rule, *viz.* “*Videndum ergo, ubi sententiam inchoet, aut vocem vocis, sententiam sententiæ copulet.*” And if they do this, I shall not be apprehensive of any contradiction to my rules; which are as follow:

#### “RULE I.

“*ו* prefixed to *future tenses* converts them to *perfect tenses*; and

“\* *Quomodo ergo cognoscetur quando simpliciter copulativum vel simul etiam conversivum sit? Respondet Elias in libro Habbachur—Si præcesserit alium præteritum (vel futurum loco præteriti positum) tum copulativum est; sin minus, conversivum judicabitur: ut מי פעל ועשה Quis fecit et operatus est? Jes. xli. 4. Videndum ergo, ubi sententiam inchoet, aut vocem voci sententiam sententiæ copulet.*”

when prefixed to verbs in the *perfect* tense it regularly converts them to the *future* tense. This is the *necessary construction* for both cases (not only "*interdum*," "*sometimes*," as the grammarians tell us, but) *always*, constantly and regularly, in *every sentence*, that is independent of the three particular circumstances described in the subsequent three rules, or *general exceptions*.

' But there is one instance of *irregularity*, or *particular exception*, which is the more extraordinary, because I believe it to be the only *particular exception* throughout the whole *Hebrew Scriptures*; and *particular exceptions* in all other languages are numerous; for instance, there are more than three hundred *particular exceptions* to the most comprehensive rules that can be formed for the pronunciation of the English tongue!

' The only instance, then, of *irregularity*, or *particular exception*, respecting *ו*, that I have been able to find, is in that portion of the 119th Psalm, wherein *ו* is the leading letter of each sentence, as an *aerostic*, or *alphabetic psalm*; which probably ought to be considered merely as a *poetical licence* for that kind of composition.

#### ' RULE II.

' When *ו* is prefixed to a verb, which immediately follows another verb of the *same tense*, without a prefixed *ו*, and in the *same sentence*, the *ו* in that case is *merely conjunctive*, and the second verb to which it is prefixed (and even a third or fourth, if they are of the *same tense*, and follow in the *same sentence* with a prefixed *ו* to each) must be construed according to its *proper tense*, whether *future* or *imperative*, and often also the *perfect* tense; but *not always*; as there are a few instances of exception, some of which shall be mentioned hereafter,

#### ' RULE III.

' A prefixed *ו* does not affect or convert any verb, in the *imperative* mood, nor any verb or verbs in the *future* tense, which follow an *imperative* mood in the same sentence. But to *perfect* tenses the prefixed *ו* is conversive without hindrance from a preceding *imperative* verb.

#### ' RULE IV.

' After an *interrogation*, either of the emphatical *ו*, or of the *interrogatory* relatives *מ* or *מה*, the prefixed *ו* doth not influence any verb or verbs of the *future* tense, or the *present* tense; but in *perfect* tenses the *ו* is regularly conversive, and is not influenced by a preceding *interrogation*.

#### ' ADDITION.—RULE V.

' [The following rule is an addition to this letter (since it was first wrote, and communicated to several learned men,) being drawn from a *parenthesis* in a sentence of *Rabbi Elias*, which the author of this tract did not understand, for want of an example, when he first wrote this letter; but having since found an example in the sacred text, he thinks himself bound in justice to *Rabbi Elias* to adopt his rule, and to add it to the other rules; viz. "If a *future* tense put for a *preterperfect* tense" (which must be by having a prefixed *ו*) "*precedes a preter tense*," (having also a prefixed *ו*), "*the latter is [merely] copulative.*" The use of this rule, most probably, will very seldom occur, but the following example has been found in 1st Samuel vii. 16. *וַיִּשְׁפֹּט שָׁמֹאֵל* (a *future* tense converted to the *preter* tense) "*and Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life: וַיֵּלֶךְ* and *HE WENT*

from year to year, וסבב and HE CIRCUITED Bethel, and Gilgal, and Mispeh, (the vau prefixed to the two last verbs are merely copulative, because the preceding verb is a converted future, "*loco praeteriti positum*," and the next verb which follows is also a converted future) וסבב "and HE JUDGED Israel in all these places." Thus the parenthesis of Rabbi Elias is in some degree established on Scripture authority.]' P. 11.

To illustrate and confirm these several rules, examples are produced under each: but, as the application of these belongs almost exclusively to the Hebrew scholar, we shall refer him to the book itself, having stated the rules as a guide to what he may expect from their use.

Mr. Sharp, however, in this and other parts of the volume before us, has evidently a view beyond the simple illustration of Hebrew grammar, useful as that object may be; for he every where avails himself of the opportunity to render his examples subservient to the illustration of the prophecies concerning the Jews, and the subversion of the popish superstition, which is done with all the energy of primitive zeal, and, we may add, with all the charity.

The *Second Tract* comprised in this volume is 'an Account of some other particulars in the Hebrew Tongue:' but, as these have their uses restricted to the reader of Hebrew, we do not detail them. The like observation applies to the *third tract*, which contains remarks 'on the Pronunciation of the Hebrew Vowel Letters, without Points: being an Attempt to restore a regular Sound to the original Hebrew Vowels, by a fair and reasonable Exertion of *Etymology*, in comparing Derivatives of various Languages with their original Hebrew Source.' This short tract discovers much ingenuity; but it will ever be a hard task to pronounce by the eye.

To these three tracts is subjoined an Appendix, in which the author distinctly avows the ultimate object of his work to be what, from the tenor of the illustrations in the first part, we have precisely stated; and what he has further advanced upon these topics, we think no reader, though indifferent to them, can peruse without receiving a deep and lasting impression. We trust that the indefatigable exertions of this excellent man to promote the love and practice of the Christian religion will not, and cannot, be in vain.

ART. VI.—*Literary Hours; or, Sketches, Critical, Narrative, and Poetical.* By Nathan Drake, M. D. Vol. III. 8vo. 9s. Boards. Cadell and Davies. 1804.

THE Literary Hours of Dr. Drake have twice agreeably occu-

pied our *literary* minutes\*. His third score of dissertations is marked by an analogous choice of topic, and a persevering urbanity of criticism. Of the new papers, those have most novelty which relate to the Scandinavian mythology, and to the poets who have chosen it for a theme: an extract from the fifty-third number may gratify, and perhaps instruct, the reader.

\* Few parts of the Gothic mythology are more loaded with absurdity and puerile invention, than that which endeavours to account for the origin of matter and the creation of the world; and as much of the imagery is scarce explicable, and were it easily so, yet would it be inapplicable to the purposes of sublime poetry, I shall drop the grosser figurative language, and explain, in more intelligible terms, the probable meaning of the northern sages.

"In the beginning," observes the *Voluspa*, a poem forming part of the more ancient Edda, "there was neither sea, nor shore, nor refreshing breezes. There was neither earth below nor heaven above to be distinguished. The whole was only one vast abyss, without herb, and without seeds. The sun had then no palace; the stars knew not their dwelling places; the moon was ignorant of her power."

"It was then that the first Almighty cause, operating on the chaotic mass, and separating the element of fire, formed in the south a world luminous and glowing. To inhabit this immense region of primal heat and light, called *Muspelsheim*, and out of which the sun was afterwards taken, he created spirits or genii of fire, over whom presided Surtur, the demon or black prince of that element. In the other extremity of the universe, the north, arose, by the same creative fiat, realms of ever-during frost, mountains of eternal ice, whose appellation was *Niflheim*, and in whose dark and dreary caverns were lodged tremendous giants, termed giants of the frost. Then, in the vast and temperate space between these two extremes, the worlds of ice and fire, he called into existence terrestrial matter, but as yet loose and uncircumscribed by figure.

"At this period, according to the Edda, the Omnipotent ceased to act upon matter by his *direct* agency, having created inferior divinities, to whom he allotted the arrangement of the terrestrial particles, the structure of the lower heavens, and the formation of man. These divinities were Odin and his offspring, who infixated the earth, circumfused the air, and, seizing upon the fires of *Muspelsheim*, formed the sun. They then erected for themselves, in the higher regions of the atmosphere, a glorious mansion, under the title of *Asgard*, or the court of the gods. Having thus prepared the earth, and constructed an abode in the heavens, worthy of their own dignity, they proceeded to create the human species, calling the man *Aske* and the woman *Emla*. These were liable, by their original constitution, to mortality; but the valiant, and the valiant alone, were admitted, after death, into *Valhalla*, the palace of Odin, where they enjoyed peculiar

---

\* See our Second Series, vol. xxvi. p. 11.



happiness for a series of ages, whilst the cowardly, and those who died of lingering disease, were plunged into *Nifflheim*, the northern hell, the seat of darkness and desolation.

‘ This state of things, however, *viz.* the duration of the earth, the existence of the gods, and their places of future punishment and bliss, Valhalla and Nifflheim, was ordained but for a season. After a long revolution of time, the spirits of fire, who, along with the giants, had always been at enmity with the gods, rush forth, headed by Surtur, followed by Lok, the evil principle of the Scandinavians, and accompanied by the most horrid monsters; they consume, with devouring flames, the earth, the sun, and stars, destroy the gods in battle, and perish themselves in the general conflagration. On this great event the first Almighty Being, he who governs all things, again appears, restores the conflicting elements to order, calls into being fresh agents, and a new earth, infinitely more perfect than the preceding, springs into light and beauty; here, for the good and virtuous, is prepared a seat of ineffable and eternal happiness, entitled Gimle, or the palace of gold, and, in the utter extremity of the universe, remote from light and life, rises the mansion of everlasting misery, the receptacle of the wicked, named Nastrond, whose walls are composed of the carcases of serpents, and through whose gates pours poison in a thousand torrents.

‘ From this broad outline, a general idea may be formed of the Gothic mythology, which is singular, perhaps, in attributing destruction to the subordinate deities, and in preparing for mankind two heavens and two hells; of the former, the first consecrated to the valiant, the second to the good; of the latter, one destined to the cowardly and diseased, the other to the wicked and profane. It is characteristic likewise of this religion, that, as understood by its more rational votaries, it preserves distinct and free, from all the mutations incident to matter, the first almighty essence, the cause of causes. This was not the case, however, with the vulgar, who confounded the great author of all things with the first of his agents Odin. Of this formidable deity, whose attributes had such a powerful influence over the minds of his worshippers, I shall now endeavour to give the most interesting particulars, preceding the account, however, by a short nomenclature of the family of Odin and his associates, or the gods and goddesses of the Edda.

‘ Odin had by his wife Frea or Hertha, whom the northern sages worshipped as the goddess of fertility, and as allegorically representing the earth, Thor, his first born, the most valiant of the gods, their defender and avenger, and who presided over the atmosphere, and ruled all its commotions. Balder, the second son of Odin, was the god of eloquence and splendour, and guided the steed of day. Niord, though not of the family of Odin, was the god of the sea, the Neptune of the Scandinavians. Frey, the son of Niord, presided over the seasons. Tyr, the protector of champions and brave men, dispensed victory in the hour of battle. Brage was the god of poetry and music. Heimdaller was the guardian of the bridge Bifrost, or the rain-bow, which connects heaven with earth. Hoder, a son of Odin, was a god, though blind, irresistibly strong, and his name was pronounced with terror. Vidar was the god of silence. Vile, the

son of Odin and Rinda, the daughter of the sun, was the god of archery, and singularly intrepid in war. Uller was the god of swiftness, whose velocity was such, that no one could stand against him. Forsete, the last and twelfth god, independent of Odin, presided over controversies, and inhabited a palace in heaven called *Glimer*.

'The same number of goddesses, with Hertha at their head, are noticed in the Edda. Second to Hertha was Saga. Eira was the goddess of medicine. Gefione of virginity. Tylla of dress and ornament. Freya of love. Lofna of reconciliation. Vara of fidelity. Snotra of learning. Vora of penetration. Lyna of safety. Synia was the portress of the palace of the goddesses. Gna the messenger of Freya.

'Besides these deities, whose names and number sometimes vary, Lok, the evil principle and calumniator of his associates, is frequently enumerated among the gods. He generated three monsters, who were brought up among the giants, namely, the wolf Fenris, the serpent of Midgard, or the serpent which surrounds the earth, and Hela the queen of death. These, with the giants and the genii of fire, wage perpetual enmity against the divinities of Asgard.

'As of many of these divinities, however, there is little worth recording, their agency being trifling, unaccommodated to the purposes of poetry, and unoperative as to society, I shall only select those whose attributes were characteristic of the people who adored them, and to whom were attached the most splendid and magnificent fables.

'Odin, the chief divinity among the Scandinavians, was worshipped as the god of war, and, in the great temple of Upsal, was represented holding a sword in his hand. The Edda describes him as a "terrible and severe god; the father of slaughter; the god that carrieth desolation and fire; the active and roaring deity; he who giveth victory and reviveth courage in the conflict."

'In Asgard, or the realm of the gods, the Olympus of the north, Odin had several palaces. In Gladheim, or the mansion of joy, a large and magnificent hall, he administered justice, sitting on an elevated seat, surrounded by the twelve gods. Justice was also frequently dispensed by him and his brother deities under a large ash-tree, named *hydrasil*. This enormous tree, whose top reaches to the highest heaven, and whose branches cover the earth, has three roots, which diverge to an infinite distance from each other; under the *first* root, which is in heaven, flows the hallowed stream of time-past, with whose sacred waters three virgins perpetually sprinkle the tree, and support the beauty of its foliage; their abode is for ever under the ash, and they dispense the date and destinies of man; their names are Urda the past, Werandi the present, and Skulda the future. Under the *second*, which extends to the land of the giants, is placed the spring of Mimer, the fountain of wisdom, and the divine liquor of Odin; and beneath the *third*, which covers *Niflheim* or hell, and is the food of the monstrous serpent *Nidhoger*, flows the fountain Vergelner, the source of the infernal rivers. On this tree sits an eagle, whose piercing eyes discover all things, whilst a squirrel is incessantly occupied in running along the branches, and conveying news from every part of the universe.

' The principal city of Odin was Valascialf, built of the purest silver, and here was established his throne, called Lidscialf, or the terror of nations, and from whence he beheld all the regions of the earth. On his shoulders, whilst sitting on this throne, sate constantly two *ravens*, named Hugo and Munnin, who, being let loose every morning, flew through every province of the globe, and, returning at night, whispered in his ears whatever they had heard and seen, whence Odin is frequently termed the *god of the ravens*.

' It was in Valhalla, however, one of his most superb palaces, he received the souls of those, who died contending on the field of battle; and every warrior, previous to the engagement, took a vow to send him the spirits of the slain, for whom, when dying sword in hand, the gates of Valhalla were ever open. To this deity prayers were offered for success in conflict, and such was his enthusiasm for martial deeds, that he was supposed often personally, mounted on his sable steed Sleipner, a horse with eight feet, to mingle in the contest, to excite the ardour of the hero, to strike those destined to perish, and to speed the parting spirit to the halls of heaven.

' The palace of Valhalla was in every respect adapted for the Elysium of the warrior; its very construction and its ornaments were warlike.

' Broken shafts of many a spear  
Emblazoning the roofs appear;  
The domes with shields are cover'd o'er,  
And coats of mail surround the floor.  
Behold! Valhalla proudly shrouds  
Her towers in the ambient clouds:  
Five hundred portals grace the side,  
With forty more unfolding wide.  
Thro' every gate in war array,  
With banners streaming to the day,  
Eight hundred warriors passage find,  
When for martial deeds inclin'd.  
Five hundred domes aspiring high,  
With forty others pierce the sky:  
There, gods in mazy lab'rins roam—  
One portal leads to every dome.

' In this magnificent dwelling the souls of the valiant enjoy the daily pleasure of arming themselves, of ranging in order of battle, and of cutting each other to pieces; but when the hour of repast approaches, they hasten to the convivial board, and free from pain or wound or animosity, feed heartily on the flesh of the boar Serimner, who is daily renewed, and is amply sufficient for the most numerous party. With this food, esteemed as the highest delicacy, they drink to intoxication plentiful draughts of mead, which is delivered to them by virgins named Valkiries in the skulls of their enemies, and who are likewise employed by Odin to select in battle those who are to perish. This mead or hydromel is the product of a goat called Heidruna, from whose paps every day flows into a vase a quantity sufficient to inebriate the company. In the Edda of Sæmund the following lines are descriptive of the joys of Valhalla.

In Odin's field,  
 Their swords the Mono-heroes wield :  
 And daily on each other bear  
 The dread conflicting storm of war.  
 Scarr'd in the fight, the chiefs divide,  
 And home on stately steeds they ride ;  
 Then with the gods in splendid halls,  
 Drink oblivion to their brawls :  
 Serimner's flesh a feast affords,  
 And concord reigns around their boards.—  
 Heidruna, wildest of the train,  
 That sport on hill or russet plain,  
 Near Odin's hall salacious breeds,  
 And on the leaves of lærad feeds.  
 His spacious horn shall fill the bowl,  
 That lifts to rapture Odin's soul ;  
 And ever drinking, ever dry—  
 Still the copious stream supply.

' Odin, however, is usually represented as sitting apart from the heroes, drinking wine instead of hydromel, and under no necessity of supporting himself by food.' p. 291.

Dr. Drake professes to make a *complete* enumeration of the English versifiers, who have occasionally hymned the Scandinavian divinities. He has, however, omitted Jerningham's Rise and Progress of Scandinavian Poetry ; Johnstone's Sagas ; an ode contained in that imitation of Chatterton, published in the Monthly Magazine (vol. x. p. 656) ; Bichard's Odin ; and the recent excellent translations of Mr. Herbert. Perhaps it would have been expedient to have extended these notices to the continental poets who have also sought a passport to immortality, by plucking the apples of Iduna. The chorus-dramas and odes of Klopstock ; the Death of Balder, by Ewald ; the Northern Flowers, by Gräter ; and some newer efforts of the Danes, might have supplied various specimens of wild invention and vigorous diction. At page 354, Dr. Drake calls Balder the god of the sun, and the Apollo of Scandinavia. For this opinion the Runic sagas supply no authority. The sun was a goddess among the Goths ; and was to become the prey of the wolf Fenris. So in the cosmogony of the Edda (we employ the translation in the Monthly Magazine, vol. vi. p. 454.)

' Ere the throat of Fenris yawn  
 To ingorge the lamp of day,  
 Shall the sun a daughter bear,  
 Who, in spite of shower and sleet,  
 Rides the road her mother rode.'

Dr. Drake has probably been betrayed into this position by a note of Percy's, in the Northern Antiquities, vol. ii. p. 73, where the bishop strives, and vainly strives, to identify the Celtic god

Belinus, who was the sun, with the Gothic god Balder, who was not.

Original poems, and reviews of the poetical works of Robert Herrick, of Joshua Sylvester, and of Michael Bruce, form the more prominent subjects of the other papers, which display a mind comprehensively versed in British literature, and fondly susceptible of poetic gratification.

ART. VII.—*The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London; abridged. Vols. II. and III. 4to. Small Paper, 4l. 4s. Large Paper, 7l. 4s. Boards. C. and R. Baldwin. 1804.*

WE proceed to notice the continuation of this very important and valuable work, and perceive, with pleasure, that the vigilance of the editors, far from relaxing, seems to be augmented. To every paper attention is paid in proportion to its importance; and a few only of the most trifling articles are omitted. The notes, which connect the early philosophical attempts with science in its present state, though not numerous, are important; and our curiosity has been greatly gratified by seeing thus, in their embryo, the first rudiments of many modern discoveries. From Dr. Hook we derive valuable hints; and perhaps the situation of the authors may enable them to pursue his early discoveries among the papers left in the possession of the Royal Society. The passages selected from his *Lampas*, where they have long lain unnoticed, by professor Robison, render us anxious for some additional information; information which may yet exist among the papers which have not hitherto been examined.

The biographical sketches in the first of these volumes are short, but satisfactory. In the second, we have peculiarly distinguished the lives of Horrox, Lewenhoeck, Kepler, Diemerbroeck, Van Helmont, sir W. Petty, Paracelsus, De la Hire, Plott, Sanctorius, Cudworth, Kunkell, Pell, and Bernouilli. There are some others of less importance. In general the accounts are very satisfactory, without the slightest inflation of style, or extravagant commendation, which so often disgust us in similar attempts. We shall select, as specimens, the lives of Horrox and Halley.

‘ This splendid genius was born at Toxteth in Lancashire, about the year 1619. From a grammar school in the country, he was sent to Cambridge, where he spent some time in academical studies. He began at fourteen years of age to apply to the study of astronomy; but from his want of books, and the moderate circumstances of his father, he could make but small progress in it. About three years after he formed an acquaintance with Mr. Wm. Crabtree, of Broughton near Manchester, who was also engaged in the same studies, and with whom a correspondence was carried on till his death. Thus encouraged, young Horrox assumed new vigour, procured other books



and instruments, and was pursuing his studies and observations with great assiduity, when his progress was suddenly arrested by the hand of death, the 3d of Jan. 1640, in the 22d year of his age.

‘What we see of his writings, in the book noticed in this article, is sufficient to show how great a loss the world had by his death. He had just finished his “*Venus in Sole visa*,” 1639, a little before. This was published in 1668, by Hevelius, as above noticed. His other posthumous works, or rather his imperfect papers, were published by Dr. Wallis, as stated in the article above, with some account of his life; in which we find he first asserts and promotes the Keplerian astronomy against the hypothesis of Lansberg; which he proves to be inconsistent with itself, and neither agreeing with theory nor observations. He vindicates Tycho Brahe from some objections made to his hypothesis, and gives a new theory of the moon; to which are added the lunar numbers of Mr. Flamsteed. There are also extracts from several letters between him and Mr. Crabtree, on various astronomical matters; with a catalogue of astronomical observations.

‘There are two things particularly which will perpetuate the memory of this very extraordinary young man. The one is, that he was the first person that ever predicted or saw the planet Venus in the sun. Though he was not aware of the great use that was to be made of it, in discovering the parallax and distance of the sun and planets, yet he made from it many useful observations, corrections, and improvements in the theory of the motions of Venus. Secondly, his new theory of lunar motions; which Newton himself made the ground-work of all his astronomy, relative to the moon; and who always spoke of our author as a genius of the first order.’ Vol. ii. p. 12.

---

‘Dr. Edmund Halley, a celebrated mathematician and astronomer, as well as one of the most eminent and useful members of the Royal Society, was born in London, An. 1656, and educated at St. Paul’s School there; from whence he was sent 1673 to Queen’s College, Oxford, where he chiefly applied himself to mathematics and astronomy, in which he soon distinguished himself in a remarkable manner, being only in his nineteenth year when he produced the above paper in the *Philosophical Transactions*, on the aphelia and eccentricity of the planets. He made a great number of accurate observations in astronomy; and the forming in that way an entire new catalogue of all the stars was a favourite object; but finding that project already occupied by Hevelius and Flamsteed, he formed the design of completing the scheme, by the addition of the stars about the south pole, which could not be seen by those astronomers in the latitude of Dantzic or Greenwich. For this purpose, he left the university before he had taken any degree, and sailed for the island of St. Helena in 1676, when he was only twenty years of age. Here, with great diligence he soon completed his catalogue of those stars, with which he returned to England the latter end of 1678, when the Royal Society immediately elected him one of their members, and the king (Charles 2d) gave him a mandamus to the university of Oxford, for the degree of A.M. In 1679 he went to Dantzic, at the request of the Royal Society to endeavour to adjust a dispute between M. Hevelius and Mr. Hook,

concerning the preference between plain and telescopic sights in astronomical instruments; from whence he returned in about two months.

In 1680 he set out on a tour through France and Italy, to establish a friendly communication among the astronomers of Europe. In Paris he completed his observations on the great comet of that year, which he had before seen in England. He returned to England in 1681, and married a lady, with whom he lived happily for fifty-five years after. In 1683 he published his "Theory of the Variation of the Magnetical Compass;" in which he supposes the whole globe of the earth to be one great magnet, having four magnetical poles or points of attraction, &c. The same year also he entered on a new method of finding the longitude, by an accurate observation of the moon's motion. In the beginning of 1684, contemplating Kepler's laws of the periods and distances of the planets, he concluded that the centripetal force must decrease in proportion to the square of the distance reciprocally. He found himself however unable to make it out in any geometrical way; and therefore, after applying in vain for assistance to Mr. Hook and sir Christopher Wren, he repaired to Cambridge to Mr. Newton, who fully supplied him with what he so ardently sought. But Halley having now found an immense treasure in Newton, could not rest till he had prevailed with the owner to enrich the public with it; and to this interview the world is in some measure indebted for the immortal Principia of Newton. That great work was published in 1686; and Halley, who had the whole care of the impression, prefixed to it a discourse of his own, giving a general account of the astronomical part of the work; and also an elegant copy of verses in Latin. In 1687 he undertook to explain the reason why the Mediterranean Sea never rises higher, though there is no visible discharge of the prodigious quantity of water that runs into it from nine large rivers, besides many small ones, and the constant setting in of the current at the mouth of the Straits; which he accounted for by the great quantity of waters raised from its surface by evaporation, which he showed by a calculation was fully adequate to the purpose. Halley's active and elevated mind next ranged through various other fields of science; hence resulted his tracts on the construction of solid problems, or equations of the third and fourth powers, with a new method for the number and the limits of their roots; exact tables of the conjunctions of Venus and Mercury, with their use in discovering the parallax and distance of the sun; new tables for showing the values of annuities on lives, calculated from bills of mortality; the universal theorem for finding the foci of optic glasses. But it would be endless to enumerate all his valuable discoveries, then communicated to the Royal Society, and published in the Philosophical Transactions, of which for many years his pieces were the chief ornament and support, in all the sciences, astronomy, geometry, and algebra, optics and dioptrics, ballistics and artillery, speculative and experimental philosophy, natural history, antiquities, philology, and criticism; all abounding with ideas new, singular and useful.

In 1691, the Savilian professorship of astronomy at Oxford being vacant, Mr. Halley applied for that office, but without success: refusing to deny or conceal his sceptical turn of mind, though his

own extraordinary merits were supported by the interest of Newton, he was rejected, and the office bestowed on Dr. Gregory. In 1698 he procured from king William the appointment of captain of a ship, sent out for the express purpose of establishing his theory of the variation of the compass, which he had advanced in 1683. He made another voyage on the same design the year following, and returned to England in September 1700, with numerous observations; from whence he soon after published his general chart, exhibiting at one view the variation of the compass in all these seas where the English navigators were acquainted. He was also soon after sent out again on a third voyage, to ascertain the course of the tides in every part of the British channel, of which, in 1702, he published a large chart. Soon after, at the request of the emperor of Germany, he made two journeys, to inspect the coasts of the Adriatic Sea, and to examine certain ports, which the emperor intended to construct or improve. He returned in 1703, when he was appointed to succeed Dr. Wallis as professor of geometry at Oxford, and was at the same time honoured with the degree of doctor of laws. Here he soon employed himself in translating into Latin, from the Arabic, Apollonius's Section of a Ratio, and in restoring the same author's two last books on the Section of a Space, from the account given of them by Pappus; which were published in 1706. He next prepared an edition of the whole works of Apollonius, and ventured to supply the whole eighth book of the Conics, the original of which was lost. To this he added, Serenus on the Sections of the Cylinder and Cone, in Greek, with a Latin translation; and published the whole in 1710. Besides these, the *Miscellanea Curiosa*, in three volumes octavo, had come out under his direction, in 1708, consisting chiefly of pieces of his own, extracted from the *Philosophical Transactions*.

In 1713, Dr. Halley succeeded sir Hans Sloane, in the office of secretary to the Royal Society; which he resigned in 1721, having been appointed Astronomer Royal on the decease of Mr. Flamsteed in 1719. And although he was now sixty-three or sixty-four years of age, yet here for the space of eighteen years he watched the heavens with the closest attention, hardly ever missing an observation, and, without any assistant, performed the whole business of the observatory himself.

About 1737 he was seized with a paralytic disorder in one of his hands. However, he still continued to come regularly once a week, to meet his friends in town on Thursdays, before the meeting of the Royal Society, at what is still called Dr. Halley's club. But his paralytic disorder increasing, his strength gradually decreased, till he expired Jan. 14, 1742, in the eighty-sixth year of his age; and his corpse was interred in the church-yard of Lee, near Blackheath.—Beside the works before-mentioned, Dr. Halley's principal publications are, 1. *Catalogus Stellarum Australium*. 2. *Tabulæ Astronomiæ*. 3. *The Astronomy of Comets*. With a multitude of papers in the *Philosophical Transactions*, from volume xi to volume lx. Vol. ii. p. 326.

In this volume we find an abridgement of Dr. Hook's collections, which fill the vacancy between the volumes of the *Trans-*

actions, from the time of their being discontinued, to that of their republication. They commence after the twelfth volume of the original, and extend, in the abridgement, from p. 473, to 551. The second volume completes the thirteenth of the original work. The following note, on the cause of a newly observed irregularity in the measure of degrees of latitude, is peculiarly important. It is a communication from Dr. Hutton.

‘ In all the measures of degrees, in different latitudes, when compared with each other, irregularities have occurred, the lengths of any of them appearing to be either too great or too little, in respect of the others, and that by differences which have no uniformity or harmony among themselves. But in the last measurement abovementioned, I am told there is an aberration in the conclusions which runs in a pretty regular and uniform series, which will probably appear in a paper of major Mudge, which I have not yet seen, to be in the next volume of the *Philosophical Transactions*, for this year 1803. Now those irregularities have usually and chiefly been ascribed to errors in the terrestrial measures. But it is our opinion that the deviations principally arise from the celestial observations, viz. the observed latitudes, resulting from the observed zenith distances of certain stars. These zenith distances are probably all or most of them erroneous, in consequence of the deviations of the plumb line of the zenith sector, produced by the unequal attractions, on the plummet, of the inequalities in the adjacent parts of the earth’s surface, sometimes in excess from hills, and sometimes in defect from valleys and seas. And this cause will very well account, not only for the usual irregularities, but particularly for that uniform deviation in major Mudge’s degrees, which are of this nature, that in going from south to north the terrestrial lengths of those degrees become successively shorter and shorter, from beginning to end, instead of measuring longer and longer, as they ought to do, from the oblate spheroidal figure of the earth. Now this aberration appears to be exactly what might be expected from the position of the part of the meridian here measured, which consists of almost three degrees, extending from Dunnose at the Isle of Wight, to the north-east corner of Yorkshire, near the mouth of the river Tees. Now by casting an eye on the map of England, or of Europe, we perceive the English channel on the south end of the line, and the still farther extended northern sea at the north end. And these hollows will naturally occasion a defect of attraction on the plummet, the one on the south and the other on the north, according as it is near the one or the other of these depressions. Hence then, at Dunnose, or the south end of that meridian line, the plummet, or the lower end of the apparent vertical line, will be drawn toward the north, while at the north end of the meridian line it will have a deviation to the south, and that in a more considerable degree than the former, on account of the more extensive depression of the northern ocean. In consequence the zenith points of the plumb line will deviate the opposite way, viz. at the southern station the apparent zenith will be too far to the south, while at the northern station it must be directed too far to the north. Hence it

must happen that the celestial difference of latitude between these two stations, being the distance between those two apparent zeniths, will be greater than the true or terrestrial difference, by the sum of the said two deviations. From which it follows that, between those two stations, the celestial arcs appearing to be too large, the observed or celestial degrees will change faster than the terrestrial or measured degrees, or will have measures less than the truth, and that always more and more in defect, in receding from the south, and approaching to the north, on account of the greater defect of matter at this latter. Thus then we have a probable cause of the inverted order in the measures of the degrees. Hence also most other measured meridians will be erroneous, especially in the parts near seas, or near large mountains. And that insular situations must be worst of any, having the plumb line deviating to the north at the south end of the land, to the south at the north end, to the east at the west side, and to the west at the east side; thus producing errors in all observed latitudes and longitudes. But suffice it, at present, just to give the hint of a probable cause of such errors and aberrations.' Vol. ii. p. 198.

In the third volume we particularly distinguish the lives of the reverend Edward Bernard, doctor David Gregory, Bonetus author of the *Sepulcretum*; doctors Croone, Drelincourt, and Charleton; Lemery, Bidloo; sir W. Molineux; Confucius, sir Hans Sloane, Mr. Plukenet; doctor Robert Sibbald, and sir Theodore Mayerne. But, from this volume, no biographical information appears of sufficient importance to induce us to select any extract.

As we approach nearer our own times, the articles are proportionally more valuable; and the notes, which connect the former with the present state of science, more interesting. The work is now no longer a publication of curiosity: it is important and useful. The editors seem to have felt the force of an observation we had occasion to make, *viz.* — that, though a paper may, in the present state of science, appear of little value, yet it is not an object of mere curiosity to see the progress of opinions on each subject, from the crudity of their first conception to the more scientific form of matured investigation. The principle is allowed in note 125 of the present volume. It is, perhaps, too great an honour to admit any thing to be owing to our remarks, or we should not have received, at the end of the third volume, an ostentatious display of obligation to the 'literary journal,' for suggesting an improvement recommended in the *first* volume of the present series of *our* Journal (p. 214); *viz.* — a more scientific division of the table of contents. The advantages are obvious: but the suggestion is so very level to the commonest capacity, that, had the change been made without notice, we should have claimed no merit from it. We now first learn, from the editors, or publishers, that it is *meritorious*, and must, of course, arrogate to ourselves the praise.



ART. VIII.—*An Account of Travels into the Interior of Southern Africa. In which is considered, the Importance of the Cape of Good Hope to the different European Powers, as a Naval and Military Station; as a Point of Security to our Indian Trade and Settlements during a War; and as a territorial Acquisition and commercial Emporium in Time of Peace: with a statistical Sketch of the whole Colony; compiled from authentic Documents. By John Barrow, Esq. &c. Vol. II. Illustrated with several Engravings. 4to. 11. 15s. Boards: Cadell and Davies. 1804.*

WE examined the first volume of this work at some length, in our Second Series, vols. xxxii. and xxxiii.; nor have we hesitated in considering it as the most complete account of Southern Africa that we have yet seen. Dulness, policy, and vanity had hitherto contributed, in different ways, to distort the picture. Too acute not to perceive the defects of the country, too honest to exaggerate its advantages, without any inducement to depress or exalt its inhabitants, Mr. Barrow seems to have given a just description of that remote part of the globe, and to have displayed, with impartiality, its merits and defects. Second volumes often hang heavy: frequently the offspring of the popularity of the first, they 'drag a slow length along.' Mr. Barrow's chief object, in the present, is to offer a statistic view of the Cape; to consider, in different relations, its advantages, and to point out the utility of retaining it as a British possession. Little was said on this subject in his former volume, since, as our author observes, its advantages were supposed to be generally felt and acknowledged. But as it is resigned, and may be yet regained, these inquiries it may soon be proper to pursue. Some farther account of the country is also added, from new excursions; and useful charts of several of its harbours are subjoined. The prefixed view of Cape Town may possess the merit of a resemblance; but, as an engraving, it is very indifferently executed. Mr. Daniell's drawings, we have reason to think, will give a more correct idea of that singular country, and its different inhabitants.

Many years since, in our review of Dr. Sparrman's Travels in South Africa\*, we pointed out the extent of this part of the continent to the east, with the advantages that might be derived from it, and the injuries likely to ensue from an inattention to this geographic fact. Our author's chart, prefixed to the first volume, fully established this circumstance; and the charts, in the present, of different bays on the south, will probably save many a distressed mariner. The work commences with some just observations on the importance of studying the disposition of the inhabitants of countries, and the advantages which our

\* See Crit. Rev. First Series, Vol. Ix. p. 322.

most rancorous enemies, the French, have derived from this method. Generally, however, they have published some part of the knowledge they attained : they have seldom misled us, though the whole detail of truth has not always been communicated. M. Vaillant, alone, is accused of wilfully deceiving his readers from political motives. In the chart before published, we remarked some discordance between the longitudes there laid down, and the narrative. This the author notices, and apologises for. The cause was not very different from one that has often produced similar effects, the distance between the narrator and the engraver. In the first chapter of the present volume, Mr. Barrow explains the principles on which his map was constructed, points out the little errors that occur in it, and confirms, by additional observations, its general accuracy.

A military expedition to the Kaffer frontier leads our author again eastward. We need not enlarge on the little insurrections and disturbances of the rebel boors, but shall select some passages which illustrate the nature of the country. We must premise, that, while the extremity of Africa was supposed to be a projecting point, it was natural to conclude, that, as on the southern point of Asia, the mountains, trending south and north, projected by some bolder cliffs into the southern ocean, and thus formed a barrier that for ages had remained unpassed. This, however, is not the fact : the mountains, at this extremity of Africa, trend east and west, forming ridges, rising above each other, as the traveller proceeds northward ; while they in like manner rise progressively on the west. The fertile land lies between the first line of terraces and the sea, and again between the contiguous ones. As the mountains seem to have been divided by some violent convulsion, apparently to have been *cleft*, the intervening valleys are named, by the Dutch, *kloofs*. Again, as the terraces rise from the western coast, their more sloping sides are towards the east : the interchange of hill and valley is therefore, on the east, less distinguishable ; and each is more fertile. This will give a sufficient idea of the country, to explain some of its physical peculiarities.

I have already expressed my doubts with regard to the Cape peninsula having originally been separated from the continent of Africa, according to the general opinion of writers, who, drawing their conclusions from a supposed retreat of the sea to prevail universally, have not given themselves the trouble to examine any further grounds for such a conjecture. The more I have attended to the isthmus that now unites them, the more I am persuaded that, instead of its having, in latter ages, been covered with the sea, the time is yet to come when that event will take place. I have already observed, that the surface is from twenty to thirty feet above the level of high water mark ; that the sand upon it, except where it is drifted into ridges, is seldom three feet deep, and it rests upon sandstone or hard gravel. I can now add, that ridges of blue schistus and granite rocks appear on va-

rious parts of the surface so elevated. Admitting that the sandstone and the gravel, which is scarcely possible, were the fragments of the mountains by which this plain is enclosed on two sides, yet neither the schistus nor the granite could have been adventitious; these two materials must have been primeval, and they abound on the most elevated as well as on the lower parts of the isthmus; in situations that cannot be less than one hundred feet above the level of the sea. But if the sea has retreated one hundred feet, in its perpendicular height, the whole continent of Africa must have been an island at the time that the Cape promontory was an island. What changes may have taken place with regard to the canals and the inland parts of the isthmus of Suez in the course of two or three thousand years it is not necessary to inquire, but the isthmus of Suez, so long ago, was a flat sandy isthmus, not much higher, nor lower, in all probability, than at the present day.

‘ I shall now offer my reasons for supposing the sea to be gaining upon the land in Southern Africa. The plain that skirts the Lion’s Rump, and is washed by Table Bay and the sea, usually called the *Green Point*, is lower, much lower, than the isthmus, and must consequently, at the same time, have also been covered with the sea. Now there is not one single appearance to denote that such has ever been the case. The Lion’s Hill declines in a gentle and uninterrupted line into the plain, an appearance which would not have taken place had it ever been beaten by the billows of the ocean. This is further obvious by attending to the side of the plain next to the water, where (the loose materials being swept away by the violence of the surge) the rocky ridges of schistus and, in places, of granite, run like so many artificial piers, sometimes to the distance of a mile, into the sea. The whole shore of the peninsula is scalloped out in the same manner, demonstrating an encroachment, rather than a retreat, of the ocean. The two ridges also of the isthmus that bound the two bays, one to the northward and the other to the southward, are the highest parts of its surface, and seem to have served the purpose of stopping the progress, rather than marking the retreat, of the sea.’  
Vol. ii. p. 63.

So far the author’s reasoning is decisive: and we think also, that l’Aguilla’s bank, extending in a circle, beyond the whole of the southern coast to the 37th degree of south latitude, may have been once a part of the continent.

‘ But the strong arguments advanced in favour of the Cape isthmus having, at no great period of time, been covered with the sea, rests on the sea-shells that have been discovered in the sand that is accumulated on its surface. Such shells may exist, though I never saw them except on the shores of the bays, but, as I have before observed, whole strata of these may be found buried in the sides of the Lion’s Hill, many hundred feet above the level of the sea. These shells have not been brought into that situation by the waves of the ocean but by birds. There is scarcely a sheltered cavern in the sides of the mountains, that rise immediately from the sea, where *living* shell fish may not be found any day in the year. Crows even, and vultures, as well as aquatic birds, detach the shell-fish from the rocks, and mount

with them in their beaks into the air; shells thus carried are said to be frequently found on the very summit even of the Table Mountain. In one cavern, as I have already observed, at the entrance of Mossel Bay, I disturbed some thousands of birds, and found as many thousands of living shell-fish scattered on the surface of a heap of shells that, for aught I know, would have filled as many thousand waggons. The presence of shells therefore, in my opinion, is no argument for the presence of the sea.' Vol. ii. p. 66.

We have noticed this fact, as, in many respects, curious, since it tends to account for the appearance of shells, in places to which the sea has never had access. We mean not to rest on it securely, till further inquiry have added to its force, but to leave it floating in the mind of the geologist.

Our author seems to think that this southern part of Africa is of an æra prior to the other continents. His arguments, however, do not show an intimate acquaintance with physical geography; for the facts recorded may be observed in many other countries, which have no peculiar claim to high antiquity. The great difficulty seems to arise from the rapidity and the short duration of the floods of the torrents, as well as from the want of great rivers. We shall not engage in an examination of our author's theory, which is not very clearly explained, but only remark that the face of the country, which we have just described, will explain the phenomena. It is now agreed, that springs do not arise from rains, but from clouds condensed by the mountains. The sudden and violent rains excite rapid torrents, of a proportionally short duration; but the rivers, produced by condensed clouds, would scarcely find their way to the ocean, unless their height could overtop the mountains. They wander consequently between the hills, till they find some minute opening to the south, through which they pour streams greatly diminished by the absorption of the dry earth. The waters, however, are not lost: they percolate between the surface and the granitic substratum, furnishing, near the shore, springs of excellent water, at no great depth. Some rivers find their way to the east; but, on the west, scarcely a rivulet can be found; an argument successfully employed to disprove the circumnavigation of Africa from the western coast; so generally is the fact allowed. We have here spoken of the larger rivers: those which really fall in numerous streams into the southern ocean, arise chiefly from the first range of hills,

From Mossel to Plettenberg's, and almost to Algoa Bay, the country is one vast forest of the finest trees. The fertility of this spot is owing to the profusion of the percolating water, which bursts out in numerous rills; but all these bays are exposed to the south-east winds, the prevailing ones of winter. The harbour is safe in summer. An arm of the sea, however, the Knysna, about eighteen miles to the west of Plettenberg's Bay,



may become an important station. The entrance is not more than half a mile wide, and the depth of water, from four to three fathoms, in the mid channel; a depth sufficient for vessels of 500 tons, though even larger may be built there, and sent out light without a cargo. The extent of the forest is said to be 250 miles, and the breadth of the vale, from the sea to the hills, from ten to twenty miles, containing many fertile plains, and probably capable of supplying corn sufficient for the whole colony.

Iron ore is not uncommon in this part of Africa: but coals for smelting it do not exist; and even the immense woods, which we have mentioned, would be soon exhausted by the operations necessary for malleable iron, independently of the impropriety of consuming fuel, where the supply is furnished so slowly. Masses of native iron are occasionally found; and one, on the Table Mountain, has a broad extremity not unlike the flook of an anchor. From this fact our author engages in some speculations respecting the period when the sea might have covered this spot: but we have now reason to suppose it may have another and very different origin.

The inhabitants of this extreme verge of the African continent have been greatly misrepresented. The Dutchman, though careful, plodding, and industrious in Europe, is, at a distance from his own home, a monster of sensuality and cruelty. His indolence is unconquerable; his gluttony unsatisfied; and humanity never stands in the way of his passion or his revenge. Such at least is the picture now before us; and we have no reason to think it overcharged.

‘ It is no easy matter to convey, by any description, an adequate idea of the condition of the peasantry of the Cape of Good Hope; so inconceivably different is it from that of the same class in Europe, or indeed in any other part of the world. The farmers in the back settlements of North America are enabled, by hard labour, to raise a superfluity of provisions beyond their own consumption, chiefly, however, in the article of grain; of animal food they have no redundancy. The peasantry of Europe labour six days in the week, the greater part of whom can barely earn a scanty subsistence for themselves and their families. But a boor of the Cape neither knows the corroding pain of an empty stomach, nor hears his children cry for a morsel of bread,—of meat I ought to say, for bread they rarely taste. A traveller, on entering their miserable hovels, needs never despair of finding their tenants unprovided. Salted beef, or flesh of the larger kinds of game, he will generally find hanging in the chimney, and it is an equal chance that the whole or greater part of a slaughtered sheep should be suspended from the roof. A Cape boor never works. Every day throughout the whole year is to him a holiday. The greatest exertion he ever makes, and which has pleasure for its object as well as profit, is the killing of game. Nor is the exercise he takes on such occasions to be measured by the activity, energy, or the fatigue that an European sportsman must sometimes undergo. A Dutch



boor, in the first instance, never traverses the heath on foot, but generally fires from the saddle. He considers the labour even of carrying his musquet to be too fatiguing, and, therefore, has a Hottentot boy trained to ride or to run after him as his armour-bearer, an office not likely in this country ever to be productive of rank or emolument.

Such, however, are the mistaken notions imbibed by listening to persons who are really ignorant, or interested to mislead, that the peasantry of the Cape have been represented as a poor and distressed people, overwhelmed with debt, burdened with taxes, and oppressed by the government in a variety of ways. How far such statements are founded in truth, will best be shewn in our statistical sketch of the settlement. In the mean time I shall just observe, as a position to be proved hereafter, that the peasantry of the Cape are better fed, more indolent, more ignorant, and more brutal, than any set of men, bearing the reputation of being civilised, upon the face of the whole earth.' Vol. ii. p. 78.

It is not only an displeasing view of human nature, that we are compelled thus to contemplate; but the country, which afforded food and supplies for numerous families, is now devoured by one fierce untameable animal. Like the tiger in the desert, he drives the other animals from his haunts, and makes a comparative solitude of an area of several miles.

Algoa Bay was, for a time, a military station; and the farmers around found considerable advantages from thus easily disposing of their property; and the activity of the officers and soldiers planted numerous gardens. The whole country, within a moderate distance, partook of their attention; and the settler soon perceived a very beneficial change in his circumstances and situation. The Hottentot also shared in the advantages of the alteration produced by British influence.

Among the many errors and prejudices, removed by a more attentive and impartial examination of persons able to distinguish, and superior to an interested perversion of the truth, we may reckon what is now ascertained of the character of the Hottentots. It is within a short period, that an attempt to form a regiment of this race was treated with the severest ridicule. We now find, that, as soldiers, they are 'an orderly, tractable, and faithful body of men, ready on all occasions to obey the orders of their officers with cheerfulness and alacrity.' During three years' service, they continued to deserve the same character: one man only deserted; and this was occasioned by circumstances of a peculiar nature.

A Hottentot is capable of strong attachments; with a readiness to acknowledge, he possesses the mind to feel, the force of a benevolent action. I never found that any little act of kindness or attention was thrown away upon a Hottentot; but, on the contrary, I have frequently had occasion to remark the joy that sparkled on his countenance, whenever an opportunity occurred to enable him to discharge

his debt of gratitude. I give full credit to all that Monsieur Le Vailant has said with regard to the fidelity and attachment he experienced from this race of men; of whom the natural character and disposition seem to approach nearer to those of the Hindûs than of any other nation.' Vol. ii. p. 108.

The Dutch boors, however, prefer the Malay slaves to the mild, the faithful, and attentive Hottentots: they seem to dread a day of horrible retribution; and may they soon meet it!

The Kaffers have been equally misrepresented. Our author's description of this race is very advantageous: the passage is long, but too interesting to be curtailed. Congo, a Kaffer chief, had been driven, in consequence of a domestic feud, from the more eastern regions, and encroached on the Dutch territory. With a manly confidence, he approached the little force with Mr. Barrow, attended by only thirty of his own people.

‘On being told how necessary it was, for the sake of preserving tranquillity, that he should quit his present station among the boors, he replied, with great firmness, that the ground he then stood upon was his own by inheritance, for that his father had been cheated out of it by a Dutch Landrost of Graef Reynet; that, however, being desirous of remaining in friendship with the English, he would remove eastward in the course of three days; but that it was impossible for him to cross the Great Fish River, as there was a deadly hatred, or, as he expressed it, *there was blood between Gaika and himself*; and that Gaika was then much too powerful for him.

‘The decided tone in which he spoke, at the head of his small party, when surrounded by British troops; his prepossessing countenance, and tall muscular figure, could not fail to excite a strong interest in his favour. An open and manly deportment, free from suspicion, fear, or embarrassment, seems to characterize the Kaffer chiefs. Though extremely good-humoured, benevolent, and hospitable, they are neither so pliant nor so passive as the Hottentot. The poorer sort are sometimes led to seek for service among the boors, and engage themselves for so many moons in consideration of so many head of cattle; and they never suffer themselves to be duped out of their hire like the easy Hottentots. The conversation with Congo ended by recommending him to withdraw his people and their cattle from the banks of the Sunday River, to which he gave a kind of reluctant assent.

‘The whole of the party that accompanied this chief were tall, upright, and well made men; affording a clear proof that animal food is by no means necessary to promote the growth of the human species, or to add strength of fibre to the muscular parts of the body; on the contrary, reasoning from the general make and stature of the Dutch boors, who gorge themselves with animal food floating in fat, from morning till night, one would be apt to conclude, that so far from being necessary, it is not even conducive to strength of muscle; but that its only tendency was to produce a laxity of the fibres, a sluggish habit of body, and extreme corpulency; for the Dutch boors, though of a monstrous size, possess neither strength nor ac-

tivity. Perhaps, indeed, these two qualities may be considered as correlatives, and that the defect of the former may be more owing to a want of the latter than to the nature of their food. Those, perhaps, who have been accustomed to observe the peasantry on the north-west coast of Ireland, a tall, strong, and brawny race of men, subsisting on butter-milk and potatoes, will think it unnecessary to produce the Kaffers as instances of the above remark; it may serve, however, to shew that difference of climate has no power to alter the general principle, and that the same cause produces the same effect in the northern parts of Europe and in the southern corner of Africa.' Vol. ii. p. 112.

Their society appears to be formed with regularity; their dwellings convenient; their food almost exclusively vegetable, consisting chiefly of seeds and various roots, mixed alone with the partly animalised fluid milk, which they employ, like some of the northern nations on this side of the globe, in a curdled state.

'I observed in the former volume, that the Kaffers were not the aborigines of the southern angle of Africa; that they might, perhaps, derive their origin from some of those wandering tribes of Arabs known by the name of *Beduins*. I am more than ever convinced they are of Arabic origin. Their pastoral habits and manners, their kind and friendly reception to strangers, their tent-shaped houses, the remains of Islamism discoverable in one of its strongest features, the circumcision of male children, universally practised among the Kaffer hordes, all denote their affinity to the Beduin tribes. Their countenance also is Arabic; the colour only differs, which in some tribes varies from deep bronze to jet black, but most generally the latter is the prevailing colour. Nor can I suppose they owe this colour to their connection with those blacks which are usually called Negroes, as they have no resemblance, in any part of the body, to the peculiar conformation of this race of human beings. To the Ethiopians, or Abyssinians they have a much closer resemblance.' Vol. ii. p. 117.

The line of separation of the negroes from the Kaffers has been stated differently. Colonel Gordon thought that from Cape Negro on the western coast, to Cape Corientes on the east, a line passing obliquely across the continent, from about latitude 17° to 23° south, formed the boundary of each nation. But this line is not the northern boundary of the Portuguese settlements on the west; and, on the east, we find the Mozambique negroes. To the southward of the Portuguese settlement on the river De la Goa, the inhabitants are Kaffers; and this race does not extend beyond Mozambique and Soffala on the east.

Canine madness and the small pox are not found among the Kaffers; and the latter, when introduced, is soon lost: its deadly poison seems in a short time to become harmless. This latter disease could not, in Mr. Barrow's opinion, have been a native

of Arabia; since the Arabs of the middle ages were the carriers of the eastern, and conquerors of the western world; and the disease would have been known, long before its present appearance. It was more probably, he thinks, an endemic of *Æthiopia*; a country which had little connexion with its neighbours, and among whom it was of course long confined. Mr. Barrow, however, is not aware that *Æthiopia* was intimately connected with Egypt, and that the latter, though sometimes the conqueror of the former, was more frequently inferior in their various contests. To whichever side the superiority is to be ascribed, the connexion is sufficiently proved; and the disease, if endemic in *Æthiopia*, must have been sooner known.

Mr. Barrow confirms his former observation, that, in proportion to the elevation of the country, or rather its distance from the coast, men and other animals are of a larger bulk. The human race was here found both considerably enlarged in bulk, and of a loftier height. The great Fish river was, at this period of our author's visit, very low; and the hippopotami had migrated; for they certainly proceed many miles from their occasional habitation, in search of fresh water. The name of sea-cow is therefore as improper, as that of sea-horse.

‘ With the natural history and habits of this extraordinary amphibious animal (if I may be allowed to call it so), we are very imperfectly acquainted; nor have I seen any figure that conveys an accurate representation of its character, shape, and magnitude, except in a drawing made from nature by Mr. Daniell, from which a print will appear in his intended publication. Nor do I know of any good figure of the African rhinoceros, which is altogether different from that of India covered with its hide of mail. The skin of the two-horned rhinoceros is comparatively smooth, and has none of the folds so remarkable in that of the one-horned species; but it is so thick that the Dutch boors cut out of it their largest *samboes* or horse-rods, which, if well prepared, are better than those of the hippopotamus, and transparent as amber. The head of this animal is very remarkable. Not only the horns sit upon the nose, but the eyes also are placed in it, being directly under the root of the larger horn; and they are so minute, that one would suppose them of little use to so huge a creature. But nature, always provident, has remedied this seeming inconvenience by placing them in projecting sockets, in which they turn in all directions like those of the little *cameleon*. Had the eye been placed in the usual part of the face, just below the projecting forehead, which is very large, the visual rays would have embraced only about 180 degrees, or half of the horizon; whereas, in their present position, they have a much greater scope, being able, I should suppose, without any motion of the head, to sweep from 260 to 370 degrees. Of two varieties of this animal Mr. Daniell has made excellent drawings, in one of which the upper horn is almost as large as the lower, and is pointed towards it.’ Vol. ii. p. 125.

Of the other natural productions of this fertile district, or ra-

ther of those districts that are fertile, we need not offer any additional account. The Floras of the botanist are filled with their treasures; the green and hot-house adorned with the splendour of their flowers, or perfumed with their odours. The heaths, the jasmins, the stapeliæ, strelitzia, and proteæ, are sufficiently known. The plumage of its beautiful birds has been fully displayed by Vaillant; in which department alone he is judicious and faithful, attentive and instructive. The noble antelope, called the hartebeest, fills its forests; and the bush-deer, with their spotted haunches, whose cry resembles the barking of a dog, at once adorn and enliven them. The elegant blue antelope has again appeared, again to be driven to the mountains, or its race to be exterminated.

The political situation of the colony must now be interesting. The larger proportion of its inhabitants are not Hollanders, but disbanded soldiers from many parts of Germany. They hang but loosely on the parent country, and are indifferent to its fate. If we can credit our author's representation, there are few of the inhabitants of this extreme part of Africa, who would not willingly admit of English supremacy.

Mr. Barrow's very interesting statistical views of this colony, pointing out its importance as a military and naval station, in a commercial light, and as a dépôt for the southern whale fishery, must be reserved for another article. The topographic description, and statistic sketch of the Cape, will also then claim some share of our attention: these constitute the last chapter of the work.

ART. IX.—*Euclidis Elementorum Libri priores XII. Ex Commandini et Gregorii Versionibus Latinis. In Usum Juventutis academicæ. Edidit, pluribus in Locis auxit, et in depravatis emendavit Samuel Episcopus Roffensis. 8vo. 9s. 6d. Boards. Payne et Mackinlay. 1802.*

ART. X.—*Euclidis Datorum Liber cum Additamento, necnon Tractatus alii ad Geometriam pertinentes. In Usum Juventutis academicæ. Curavit et edidit Samuel Episcopus Asaphensis. 8vo. 7s. Boards. Payne et Mackinlay. 1803.*

WERE we called upon to enumerate the various editions of Euclid which have been published in this country, between the year 1570, when Billingsley's Euclid was published, 'with a verie fruitfull preface by Mr. John Dee' dated from 'my poore-house at Mortlake,' to the present time, in which we are presented with the first twelve books from the episcopal palace at Bromley, we should find it no easy task. To select from these such editions as are most deserving of a place in the library of



a student, would be far less difficult: but to determine whether the volumes now before us have any peculiar claims to such distinction, is an affair of less labour than either; and to this our attention is at the present time to be directed.

Dr. Horsley, in this edition of the *Elements*, has followed, with trifling variations, the text of Commandine in the first six, the eleventh, and twelfth books; in the four intermediate books, he has adopted the translation of Dr. Gregory, as given in the Oxford complete edition of Euclid in 1703. The alterations and emendations made by the learned bishop are neither very numerous nor very important: but the volume is throughout printed with tolerable neatness and accuracy, and may therefore, if on no other account, be acceptable to such as wish for a handsome modern Latin edition of this part of the *Elements*. We are, we acknowledge, at some loss to ascertain what motives induced his lordship to publish twelve books, and only twelve, of the *Elements*. He seems to consider the first six, with the eleventh and twelfth, as not laying a sufficiently extended basis for the young mathematician to erect his future structure upon. Yet the chief, if not the only benefit that can accrue from the perusal of the seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth books, is that of being made acquainted with the method adopted by so exquisite a logician and geometer, in investigating the nature of a branch of science then imperfectly understood: we affirm, without hesitation, that so far from their being well fitted to assist the student in demonstrating many of the rules of arithmetic, they would rather tend to impede his progress in this respect; and the reason is obvious,—for it is not to be expected that the Greeks, with their imperfect numeral characters, should possess any modes of unfolding the properties of numbers but what are decidedly inferior to those which naturally arise out of the arithmetical notation, blended with the analytical compendiums of language, now prevalent among Europeans. If this statement be correct (and we have little fear of its being controverted), it would be best either to publish the fifteen books complete, as a system of geometry which every professed mathematician ought to possess; or, on the other hand, when the work (as in the present case) is intended for young students, to publish only the first six with the eleventh and twelfth. Indeed, we must be free to affirm, that, if among mathematicians on the continent the geometrical method is too frequently discarded, it is no less true that among us there is a kind of superstitious veneration for the *Elements* of Euclid. We acknowledge that these *Elements* demand as great a portion of esteem, for their orderly arrangement, their accuracy, and their intrinsic value, as any of the works of antiquity which have been transmitted to the present times: but it does not follow, as a necessary consequence, that they are

now better fitted than any others for the purposes of instruction. Let it be considered, that, when these Elements were composed, the whole of mathematical knowledge extended but a little way beyond the precincts of pure geometry; whereas, in these times, the principles of geometry merely form a foundation for a vast and extensive edifice, comprising within its boundaries much science of which the ancients had no conception: so that the time, employed by a student in learning a great portion of Euclid, must be stolen from that which ought to be devoted to the study and application of the modern analysis. In addition to this, let it be recollected, that, though these Elements are very comprehensive, they do not contain several propositions of great use, which may be found in other systems of half their size; and that some parts, and especially the theory of parallel lines and the doctrine of proportion, are discussed in such a manner as is not, in all respects, satisfactory to the learned, while they throw obstacles in the way of the student which are extremely embarrassing. On these accounts, although we would by no means advise that the Elements of Euclid should be completely set aside, we must strongly protest against their being put into the hands of students, to the exclusion of some of the more concise works of geometry, at the entrance upon their mathematical course.

But, to return to the edition of our learned prelate. The alterations, as before observed, are slight. The first we noticed, relates to the theory of parallel lines; a doctrine in which, it is pretty well known, that even that profound geometer Dr. Simson erred, by assuming, in the fifth proposition of his note relative to the twelfth axiom, a particular case of what the whole was intended to establish. The present editor has fallen into a similar mistake, in endeavouring to demonstrate the same axiom: his process of reasoning takes for granted another axiom, and implies a new definition—that of lines inclined to each other; and, after all, this attempt at a proof is nothing else than a *petitio principii*.

In the second book, nothing remarkable occurs. In the third book, the usual definition, that 'equal circles are those which have equal diameters,' is given as an axiom: this is surely an alteration for the worse; the thing asserted as a proposition is capable of proof by juxtaposition of parts, and, if altered at all from Euclid, should manifestly have been placed among the propositions. In this book, however, there are some judicious alterations in the diagrams and proofs, which will render them less perplexing to the learner: and some useful corollaries are extracted from Clavius. The fourth book would have admitted of an alteration or two, which we sought in vain in this edition. The tenth proposition, as enunciated and constructed here, is not properly limited: nor is its application to the construction

of the subsequent problem so practical and simple as it might be readily made, by proposing, instead of the tenth proposition, the following: 'To inscribe an isosceles triangle in a given circle, that shall have each of the angles at its base, double the angle at its vertex.' To this enunciation the construction and proof may be very easily accommodated.

In the fifth book, to which the language in the bishop's preface induced us to turn with eagerness, we find no material improvement. The order of the definitions is rather varied, and some remarks are added upon the definition of greater and less ratio; respecting which we make no observations, as we have neither room nor inclination to enter into the dispute whether ratio ought or ought not to be considered as quantity. The third and twenty-fourth propositions of the sixth book have here undergone advantageous alterations: but we were rather surprised not to find at the end of this book some of the useful additions of Simson and Stone. It is true, these two geometers were North Britons; and perhaps the bishop may conceive it would be derogatory to the character of a dignified episcopalian to borrow any thing from the works of presbyterian mathematicians.

The seventh, eighth, and ninth books contain nothing of importance to call for remarks: but the remaining three are in a few places altered and amended. All together, this edition of the Elements does not demand either censure or praise strongly marked: we do not think it superior to several which are commonly circulated, nor perhaps should we be justified in saying it was inferior to any, except Simson's and Ingram's.

We now pass on to the second volume, on which there will be no occasion to dwell long. It contains Euclid's Data, with an additional book of data by the editor; select geometrical problems; a book on the properties of the sphere, taken chiefly from Theodosius; Archimedes on the dimensions of the circle, with the commentary of Eutocius; a tract on the sieve of Eratosthenes, and its use in finding prime numbers; another tract on prime and composite numbers; and last'y Dr. Keill's dissertation on logarithms, with notes and an appendix by the editor. With respect to the Data, we think the bishop would have done a more essential service to students, had he abridged Euclid's piece, rather than added a fresh book: it would be no difficult task to fill a whole volume with new data; but, after the first forty or fifty propositions, we should estimate the value of the remainder in the inverse ratio of their number. Most of the select problems are from Newton's Universal Arithmetic: the solutions are by the editor, and furnish favourable specimens of his precision and skill as a geometer. The book on spherics is quite elementary, and contains nothing but what is pretty well known. Archimedes's disquisition on the dimen-

sions of the circle will always be read with pleasure by the mathematician: but we must be permitted to think that the placing it in this volume, in company with Eutocius's tedious commentary, is completely useless; especially as the bishop's third volume [noticed in our Review for June, 1801] contains the explanation of a method of finding the circle's circumference, far better adapted to the comprehension of students.

The tract on the sieve of Eratosthenes furnishes some curious, but not very useful, information. It may not perhaps be recollected by all our readers, that what is now known by the name of *Eratosthenes's sieve*, was a method invented by that mathematician for finding prime numbers. In the series of even numbers, *two* is manifestly the only prime: to discover the rest, which must be sought among the odd numbers, Eratosthenes wrote on a board, or a paper stretched tight, the series of odd numbers; and then under every third, fifth, seventh, &c. of these numbers he made a hole in the board or paper, thus forming a kind of sieve, through the holes of which he supposed all the numbers to fall except the primes, which he made to remain upon the sieve. The method was certainly ingenious; but our author estimates its value far too highly. Of what use, we would ask, is this sieve in determining whether any very large number proposed at random be a prime number? The additional tract, by the bishop, on prime and composite numbers, exhibits some well-arranged and useful propositions: but the sober gravity of our critical bench was strangely disturbed, when, after weighing the individual merit of each proposition, we had to encounter, at p. 109, a long table of *aliquot parts of a pound sterling*! This reminded some of our quorum, of the tables of *weights and measures* towards the end of *Waddington's Navigation*, and of the reply made by that author when he was asked how he came to insert them—'*Why, the press waited, and so—*' and so, Mr. Waddington, you might as well have introduced three or four pages from honest John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. '*Simili modo,*' says the bishop, '*partes aliquot libræ ponderalis inveniantur.*' And really it is to be regretted that the table of the aliquot parts of the avoirdupois pound, at least, was not inserted: in conjunction with the table already given, it might have materially assisted the Oxonians in adjusting accounts with their college butlers.

Dr. Keill's dissertation on logarithms, with some useful notes by the editor, conclude the volume. And the two volumes now examined, together with the third volume (the first in the order of publication), we believe, complete the bishop's undertaking. The whole tends more, in our opinion, to show his lordship's talents, than his judgement, as an author on the rudiments of mathematics. That which is useful, and that which is useless, in these volumes, may be divided into nearly equal

portions. The tutor who would make use of this course, must lop off many superfluous branches, and engraft on the stock several which the bishop has disregarded. It is truly extraordinary that Dr. Horsley should not give the student any directions whatever with regard to the doctrine of fluxions, and other parts of the modern analysis: besides the substance of his own three volumes, he advises the learner to study Maclaurin's Algebra, some treatises of plane and Mercator's sailing, and the elements of conic sections. 'From this period,' says he, 'we leave the student to his own taste and genius;' so that, in the opinion of an English editor of the *Complete Works of Newton*, it seems a matter of trifling importance, whether a young mathematician learn the principles of fluxions at all, or learn them erroneously!

ART. XI.—*Topography of Troy and its Vicinity, illustrated and explained by Drawings and Descriptions; dedicated, by Permission, to her Grace the Duchess of Devonshire. By William Gell, Esq. M. A. &c. Folio. 10l. 10s. Boards. Longman and Rees. 1804.*

THE controversy excited by the scepticism of Mr. Bryant, and the events of war, which led so many of our countrymen to the East, have equally contributed to illustrate the scene of Homer's immortal poem. It is singular, however, that any controversy could have arisen on the subject. The descriptions of Homer are not general, vague, or inconsistent. In his comprehensive mind there was a plan; and events are appropriated to a given spot. A plain shore is described; two rivers of unequal magnitude and rapidity; a city well fortified; an acropolis in a more elevated situation; warm springs in the neighbourhood of the river. The plain is said to lie between two promontories, at the entrance of the Hellespont. It is nevertheless extraordinary, that Demetrius, a native of the Troad, so much nearer the event, should have spoken with hesitation respecting the situation of the city, and, from his doubts and misconceptions, should have sanctioned the incredulity of others. If our author be credited (and he seems to us highly worthy of credit), the whole is clear and appropriate: the events accord with the scene, with some inconsiderable, and probable, changes from a series of ages. We see on every side the country which Homer saw in his mind's eye, and which he must at some period have sensibly surveyed. As we have formerly shown also, he might well have conversed with those who had seen Ulysses and



some of the surviving heroes of his epic. In this work we realise the scenes which have so often animated us in the page of Homer,

— parvam Trojam, simulataque magnis  
Pergama, et arentem, Xanthi cognomine, rivum,  
— Scæaque . . . . . limina portæ.

The *Ægean Sea*, studded with the numerous islands of Greece, trends northward from the Mediterranean, indenting deeply the western coasts of Caria, Lydia, and Mysia, before it successfully penetrates the continent, on the far-famed Hellespont, which leads to the Propontis. The indentation, immediately below the Hellespont, is the Gulf of Adramyttium, trending west, and a little to the north. The high mountains, interposed between this gulf and the most southern bank of the Propontis, are the source of numerous rivers, which almost insulate the country on the west of *the Troad*; and at the entrance of the Hellespont, on the southern coast, was the site of ancient Troy. Across the Gulf of Adramyttium, lies the island Lesbos; and from its eastern coast, Mitylene, Mr. Gell commences his voyage.

At Mitylene our author sees, on the almost opposite coast of the Troad, a chain of elevated mountains, constantly obscured by a dark fog, projecting into the sea at Cape Beba (antecedently the promontory Lectum), and gradually rising till they form the celebrated Ida. Of this country, and of these broken mountains, he gives clear, pleasing, and characteristic sketches. From the promontory Lectum, the country assumes an abrupt aspect; and, on the first plain, led by the coincidence of two streams, Mr. Bryant places Troy. The early travellers adopted the same idea, and the ruins are said to be those of Alexandria Troas: they are so marked in the map of d'Anville. The country now becomes less mountainous, but is more interesting as we approach the Hellespont. We see Mount Ida in a new direction, and recognise the most southern of the tumuli; probably, as our author supposes, the tumulus of Peneleüs, since Protesilaüs was evidently interred on the Thracian Chersonnesus.

We now double the Sigeon promontory. Homer places the scene of action between two promontories, without assigning them any names. The Sigeon is undisputed; but on the north a more projecting point is still observable, called, by the Turks, Koum Kale. Yet from the description of Homer, the concurring testimony of Strabo, with the present appearances, it is highly probable that much ground has been gained from the sea. The coast is now flat and sandy. To admit therefore of a shore of adequate extent, from the Sigeon to the Rhœtean promontory, the course of the Simoïs must have been changed, in con-

sequence of natural operations or by art. Our author suspects, that, about a mile and a half above its present embouchure, it assumed a north-eastern direction, and fell into the sea, near what was then the mouth of the Thymbrius. This he thinks probable from his observations on the spot; and it is, indeed, indispensable to his system.

In contemplating the plain on which the Greeks must have been encamped, in this view of our author's topography, it will be evident why an elevated spot was chosen by Hector between it and Troy, as a post from which the movements of the Greeks were to be ascertained (Il. ii. v. 794). The spot selected was near the camp, since the son of Priam was to trust to his swiftness in case of surprise; and though the acropolis was elevated, some intervening hills obstruct the view from it of the whole plain. The tomb of *Æsyetes*, on the north-west of the city, seems adapted in every respect for this station, and there can be little doubt of its having been the spot selected.

Between the two promontories, then, was the camp of the Grecians. On the right was the station of Achilles, near, and a little above, the Sigeon promontory; on the left, that of Ajax, called *Aianteum* in the time of Strabo, and near the *Rhœtean* promontory, since we know this was the station of Ajax, and that he was buried near it. The whole of this space can be little less than three miles, on a flat shore, where the ships could be drawn on the land. Here was sufficient room for the 1100 ships of which the Grecian fleet consisted, especially if it be admitted, as we think it must, that the smaller ones were advanced some way further in-land than the larger. We are expressly told that they were arranged *πρὸς πλοῖα*, like a ladder. The rivers, as we have observed, had not their present course: the Simois fell into the Hellespont further on the left: and, as a specimen of our author's reasoning, we shall select his observations on this subject. We prefer this passage, as it has but a slight connexion with the plates.

‘ That the Trojan rivers fell into the Hellespont near the site of the tomb of Ajax, at the time of the encampment of the Greeks, appears probable from Homer, for if the streams had passed the camp near the station of Achilles, the fords of Simois only (if such existed) would have been in the road to Troy. No such fords are however mentioned, nor does it any where appear that the river passed through the camp. If again, the rivers formed the boundary of the camp on the side of Achilles, the united streams must have been first crossed, and afterwards the Scamander or Xanthus alone, in the way to Troy, for it is evident the fords of Xanthus were in the direct road, being passed by Priam in his journey to the camp, and by the Trojans when flying before Achilles.

‘ We find no mention of the two fords, those only of Xanthus oc-

cunning in the *Iliad*. These fords of the Scamander were also above the junction, as will be shown at a future opportunity. That the rivers did not divide the station of the Greeks may be collected from the circumstance of the mart, the places of worship, and courts of justice, having been placed in the centre of the camp. These, added to the communication necessary for the opposite quarters of the encampment, are sufficient reasons for supposing that places of such general resort were not in a position liable to be rendered very difficult of access by the sudden increase of a gulphy and rapid river.

Moreover, at the present day, the Simois, when deprived of almost the whole tribute of the Xanthus, has a channel one hundred yards in breadth and three feet in depth, it must often have become a most inconvenient separation to the encampment, particularly as it runs with great rapidity: and if it be objected that the Simois during the summer is only an inconsiderable stream, yet it should be observed that the armies could not have supported such a separation as the river must at times have occasioned, without manifest disadvantage, for so short a space as a month. The people of the country said, that the rains in the first week of November, previous to my visit to the Troad, had filled the channel of the Simois; in the beginning of December I saw it full and rapid; and I saw it in the last week of January equally violent, though the melting of the snow had not then commenced on Ida, which has been generally supposed to be the only supply of this river. If then we are tolerably certain that the Simois is not only a river, but a large one during three or four of the winter months, it ought not to be considered merely as an occasional torrent, or an immortal rivulet. Having observed that the river could not have terminated the camp on the right, and that it is highly improbable it should have passed through the camp, it remains to be shown, that the left was bounded by the stream. Homer introduces Achilles saying, that Hector would never attack the camp on the quarter where he commanded. We also find, that when the camp was stormed, it was at the station of Ajax. Now Ajax defended the ship of Protesilaus, which was near his own. Patroclus came to his assistance and drove off the Trojans, who were pursued to a little distance. That hero returning to the ships, met the Lycian auxiliaries, who had not fled as soon as the Trojans, and their leader Sarpedon was slain. Hence it is evident, that the Lycians were engaged at the left of the Greek camp when Patroclus arrived at the ship of Protesilaus, and even more to the left than that ship, for otherwise they would have escaped prior to the flight of Hector, as all who saw the armour of Achilles fled.

The intercepted Lycians were slaughtered between the ships, the wall of the camp, and the river; consequently the river must have been on the left of the camp, and near the station of Ajax.

This also proves that the stream was at that time copious and rapid, for if not, it would have been incapable of presenting an impassable barrier to the Lycians, who doubtless would have crossed it if that method of saving themselves had been practicable.

The Greeks, when drawn up in battle array, overspread the Scamandrian plain. It will be shown in the dissertation on plate 17,

that the portion distinguished by that name lay on the left bank of the Scamander, a circumstance almost decisive with regard to the position of the camp.' p. 40.

The cause of the change of the direction of the river is ingeniously explained. The sand, brought down by the impetuous Simois, is not lodged wholly at its mouth, but, by the concurrence of the stream of the Hellespont, on the left bank. This will of course change the direction of the river to the right, and the more so, as the shore is flat, and the sand easily accumulated. The ground gained is still very evident; and the marshes, which probably occasioned the pestilence in the Grecian camp, still exist at this spot.

Some pleasing representations of the more internal parts of the Troad follow; and the tumulus of the Greeks, the large tumulus near the fortification or wall of the camp, where numerous undistinguished bodies were interred, seems still to remain. It retains its office, and is now a Turkish burying-ground. Our author next examines the division of the plain of Troy into three districts: that between the junction of the Simois and Scamander was called more strictly the Trojan or the Illician Field; that beyond the Scamander, the Scamandrian; and, though, for reasons that occur in the passage quoted, we do not hear from Homer of the Simoisian Field, we may suppose its existence, since it is mentioned by Strabo. Mr. Gell differs from Dr. Chandler, and thinks that Chevalier did *not* mistake the Scamander for the Simois, as that author seems to suspect. The junction of these two rivers Mr. Gell has examined with great attention, and ascertained with considerable accuracy. He seems also to have fully proved that the fords were above the junction.

The 19th plate is a view from the tomb of Archilochus; and the whole plain is laid down with a protractor, so that, when the sides are raised, it has the effect of a panorama. We particularly mention this plate, because we found it peculiarly interesting. With a slight attention it places you on the spot, and gives a clear and distinct idea of the scene of the *μυρία Λαίων αλγέα*. Yet, interesting as it is, it cannot furnish many subjects of remark. Several of our author's observations have been anticipated; and we can only add that the site of *Ilium recens* was probably the modern Tchiblak. We have often had occasion to observe, that this city was much nearer to the sea than the Troy of Homer; and it seems to have been much nearer in the time of Strabo, as the sea had continued to gain on the land from the date of the Trojan war. The modern Tchiblak is to the north of Pergama.

We must pass by many minuter objects represented in these

plates, as well as the disquisitions which they occasion. We mean not that they are uninteresting; for to the classical scholar every step is sacred; and every spot between the Grecian camp and Troy is illustrated by our author's pencil. We must sit down before the city—not hostilely, but as amateurs and antiquaries. We may begin with observing, that if Homer had a distinct spot in his mind's eye, if he described an existing city, this most probably must have been its situation. The circumstances, stated in the beginning of this article, are so strong as to enforce conviction. The Scæan gate, for instance, was near the Erineos, the grove of wild fig-trees; and on the other side were the hot springs. The springs remain, and on the other side is an elevation, probably the situation of the grove, as hence the city must, as has been represented, have been most assailable. At the lower part is situated the modern city Bounarbashi; on a height behind, at a distance by no means too considerable to be included in the city, was probably the acropolis. It is singular, that, on the sides of this hill, remains of masonry and rude ornaments are discoverable; we mean rude in comparison of the works of Greece in her most polished period. It is singular, we say, since, even in the time of Alexander, no ruins were said to be discoverable. Yet we cannot refuse the testimony of Homer himself, who has given such decisive, appropriate descriptions, as are realised in the spot before us. If he had in his mind no real distinct place, it is beyond calculation that such a description should be realised in the very region which uniform tradition had fixed as the scene. The hot springs in particular are still found at about  $61\frac{1}{2}$  of Fahrenheit,  $16\frac{1}{4}$  of Celsius's scale. The cold waters, at a little distance, are only comparatively cold, as the cistern into which they are poured is larger, and consequently the waters, newly discharged, are mixed with colder ones. Our author's observations on the Erineos we shall add.

‘The Erineos, or hill of the wild fig-tree, next occurs. This spot has long been sought by the writers upon the topography of Troy, and some have represented the springs of Scamander at a much greater distance from Bounarbashi than they really are, for the sake of bringing in the hill to the west of the village under the name of Erineos. The true characteristics of the Erineos are, that it was near the Scæan gate, for the springs were near that entrance, yet the Erineos was passed in the way to them. The Erineos was also in the direct road from the tomb of Ilus and the fords of Xanthus to the Scæan gate, for some of the Trojans being routed, in the battle of the eleventh book, fled before Agamemnon, through the middle of the plain, past the Erineos, halting when they had reached the beech-tree and the Scæan gate. Homer adds, that the fugitives were very anxious to reach the city, consequently they took the



nearest way, and Erineos must be in the direct line between the fords of Xanthus and the Scaean gate. It was also not distant, and in the plain, as some have supposed it, but close to the city, so that the wall was thrice in danger of being scaled from it. It was ornamented by a wild fig-tree, and was an eminence, for the wind is said to beat upon it. In all these respects, no spot could correspond better with the description, than the Turkish burial-ground does with the Erineos of Homer, as may be seen in the general map. The chariot-road succeeded the Erineos in the flight of Hector. Now the chariot-road led from the gate toward the sea and camp of the Greeks, at least we read of no other in the *Iliad*; and the proof is that Hector meets in his way some of the Greek troops who came from the camp, and who are commanded by Achilles not to discharge their weapons at him. Having passed the road, he came to the springs. Now had not the Erineos, the projecting tower, and the great tower of Ilion been on the right of the road, coming from Troy, the chariot-road would not have been in the way of a person running toward the springs, and without such a disposition the track of Hector would be incomprehensible. Achilles approached from the banks of Scamander on the left of the road from Troy, whither he had been led by Apollo under the disguise of Agenor. Hector was leaning against a tower on the right of the road, and suffered Achilles to get nearer the Scaean gate than himself, before his courage forsook him, and had not this been the case, the way to security in the city must always have been open to the Trojan chief. Achilles in this pursuit having once placed himself nearer the wall than his opponent, had a smaller circle to move in, and consequently easily prevented the approach of Hector to the walls, which he attempted three times, in hopes that his friends would be able to pierce Achilles with missile weapons from the battlements. It is necessary to observe, that according to the poet, Hector did not turn till he had passed the springs the first time, when directing his course toward the wall he was prevented by Achilles, who obliged him to retrace his steps. On the approach of Hector to the walls in the second circuit, Achilles intercepted him again. Being thus compelled to pursue his original course, Hector passed the fountains a third time, and after making a third and fruitless essay to place himself under the protection of the fortification he returned to the springs, resolved to try the fortune of a combat with the enemy. It has been generally supposed that Hector was pursued by Achilles thrice round the walls of Troy, and was afterwards dragged three times round the whole circle of the fortifications by the enraged conqueror. Achilles, however, having slain his adversary, considered for a moment whether he should not at that instant attack the city, and endeavour to take it while the Trojans were in the greatest consternation; but having quickly recollected that the manes of Patroclus were unappeased, he gave up all idea of immediate conquest, and hastened back to the fleet, dragging after him the body of the Trojan chief.' p. 82.

Mr. Gell, with many commentators on Homer, rejects the idea of Achilles dragging the body of Hector three times round the city, as this circuit would have employed many hours, in

which, at a distance from his Myrmidons, he might have been intercepted with ease. Indeed, as he justly observes, the word *περι* does not exclusively mean *around*. If the system just ad-duced be true, he might have dragged him in triumph three times in view of the tower.

Our author's labours are then employed in illustrating other parts of the spot in which the city was probably once situated. The principal part was the acropolis; and here three tumuli occur. It was not very unusual, he remarks, to raise tumuli in the midst of a city; and he instances the tumulus of Autonöis at Delphi and that of Canathus at Thebes. Besides, Homer mentions Priam's express declaration to Achilles, that he shall be interred within the walls. The second is probably the tumulus of Priam, who is said by all the ancient writers to have been slain by Neoptolemus, at the altar of the Hercean Jupiter: the third may be that of Deïphobus, who was the most renowned of the Trojan heroes after the death of Hector. These tumuli were apparently separated from the acropolis by a wall, which was not a part of the defence. The last view that we shall mention, is one of the whole plain taken from the acropolis. It is clear, brilliant, and distinct. We need not of course add that it is interesting.

Though we wished to have finished the whole in one article, we find it now necessary to pause. Some of the remaining subjects will require discussions which would lead us too far; we shall therefore conclude our present observations with a general account of the work, its ornaments, and illustrations.

It is elegantly printed; and the vignette, in the title, is a delineation, from fancy, of Troy, *Ἰλιος ἑστῆς*, rising almost from the banks of the Simois to the acropolis. The Introduction contains a narrative of the events of the journey, in which we must first notice our author's own account of his work.

‘In approaching the Troad, each bay, mountain, and promontory, presented something new to the eye, and excited the most agreeable reflections in the mind—so that in a few days, I found myself in possession of a number of observations and drawings, taken in a part of the world concerning which, although much has been written, there still existed a great deficiency of those materials which might enable the reader to form a satisfactory opinion, without encountering the difficulties of a tedious voyage. I thought that such information would gratify men of literature and enquiry.—I was confident, that delineations and descriptions of a fertile plain, watered by abundant and perennial streams, affording almost impregnable positions, and so situated, as to command one of the most important passes in the world, must be interesting, not to say valuable, to politicians and statesmen. It is perhaps unnecessary to add, that I was not without the hope of convincing others, as I had been myself convinced, that the history, as related by Homer, is confirmed by the fullest testimony, which a perfect correspondence between the

present face of the country and the description of the poet can possibly give to it.

'To attempt elegance of style in a work of mere description, would be so much out of place, that I am persuaded an apology will not be required for such imperfections of language as may be found in this volume. I am well aware, that my anxiety to give the reader a thorough knowledge of the country, may in some cases have led me into useless repetitions, while, in others, the mention of many particulars may be omitted; which I have falsely imagined were generally known. In regard to the plates, I can truly aver that they are accurate copies of faithful drawings made by myself on the spot, and I think I am justified in observing, that those who are interested in the subject, by a careful examination of them may acquire as clear a conception of the plain and its environs, as a traveller who is not a draughtsman, could obtain in the country itself. In the description of the plates, I have confined myself for the most part to the single object of illustrating the topography of the Iliad; yet as the relation of the few occurrences we met with during our short journey, may not be entirely uninteresting to some of my readers, I have not omitted to insert it.' *Introduct. p. 1.*

Our travellers seem to have met with few difficulties in this journey. Every assistance that they wanted was offered; and they conciliated perhaps more esteem from the numerous abruptions of the modern toilet. They pass the ruins of Alexandria Troas, where there are different remains, 'though not comparable to the works of Grecians in other countries.' They next proceed to the Troy of Priam, where they find fragments of houses and temples, of an age far anterior to that of the modern inhabitants, and of a superior workmanship. These ruins will be the subject of some remarks in another article.

Though the moderns have represented the Simoïs as an insignificant stream, it is really a considerable river, and with difficulty forded in many places. The 'yellow Xanthus' also appeared to our travellers by no means so small as even Homer describes it.

The plates which represent the different parts of the coast and of the Troad, are 41 in number: some of these are vignettes, some small parts only of the shore. They are etchings coloured; and the effect, we have said, is peculiarly clear and brilliant. Two fragments, one in white marble, probably a metope of a Doric temple, and another the capital of a column, not unlike what occurs in some Saxon churches, are the subjects of figures 42 and 43. A plan of the city of Troy, and a map of the plain of Troy, are added: One other addition is wanting—*viz.* a distinct map of what may be styled the peninsula, from the Gulf of Adramyttium to the southern curvature of the Propontis, with the high mountains between the two seas, which, we have said, are the sources of numerous rivers. The map of the plain of Troy, in its present state, is so wholly destitute of collateral assistance from the neighbouring coasts, as to give not the

slightest idea of its situation ; and the small part of the Thracian Chersonnesus introduced, confuses instead of assisting the mind. Though well acquainted with the situation of the Troad, this unfortunate part of Europe in a corner, the gross error in the direction of its coast, the omission of the northern coast of Asia, and, above all, the inversion of the map, where the north, contrary to the usual custom, is placed at the bottom, disturbed so much our former ideas, that we could with difficulty recover them. In a work where there are so few faults, we greatly regret that there should be any. We ought not, however, to conclude this our first article without again expressing our approbation of the design, and the execution, of this volume, as well as the pleasure we have received from the author's labours.

ART. XII.—*Letters written by the late Earl of Chatham to his Nephew, Thomas Pitt, Esq. (afterwards Lord Camelford) then at Cambridge. Small 8vo. 5s. Boards. Payne. 1804.*

THE slightest observations from the pen of a man of genius will always command respect ; and the familiar undisguised thoughts of lord Chatham must not only bear the stamp of genius, but be, in every view, of the highest value. When Mr. Pitt, and a cornet in a regiment of dragoons, in a provincial town of some note, he had occasion to call for the advice of a physician. The physician, equally distinguished for learning and abilities, *at that time* spoke of his patient as a man peculiarly acute and able—adding, ‘I would not dispute with him even on a medical question, if he had half an hour to prepare for it.’

These letters, though slight, written on the spur of the moment, and frequently when the mind was harassed with disease or occupied with more important business, still show the acute comprehensive genius of the author, and teach us what might be expected from him, when this vast power was exerted with all its gigantic energy. On the other hand, when we perceive that a mind, which could govern the world, which dictated to Europe, and raised the desponding spirits of a nation to confidence and to victory, can thus bend, in easy familiar language, to give lessons of wisdom and virtue to a boy, we are led to admire its versatility, as much as we were before astonished at its comprehensive powers. Yet we must not mislead the reader. These letters are few and slight : they are sketches only ; yet they are the sketches of a master, and such as will always please, always interest, without borrowing any part of the pleasure they convey from a contemplation of the character or rank of the writer.

The editor, lord Grenville, by whom they are dedicated to the present chancellor of the exchequer, introduces them by a preface, which is a very elegant and finished composition. The following remarks are highly honourable to his head and heart.

‘The editor’s wish to do honour to the memory both of the person by whom they were written, and of him to whom they were addressed, would alone have rendered him desirous of making these papers public. But he feels a much higher motive, in the hope of promoting by such a publication the inseparable interests of learning, virtue, and religion. By the writers of that school, whose philosophy consists in the degradation of virtue, it has often been triumphantly declared, that no excellence of character can stand the test of close observation: that no man is a hero to his domestic servants, or to his familiar friends. How much more just, as well as more amiable and dignified, is the opposite sentiment, delivered to us in the words of Plutarch, and illustrated throughout all his writings! “Real virtue,” says that inimitable moralist, “is most loved, where it is most nearly seen: and no respect which it commands from strangers, can equal the never-ceasing admiration it excites in the daily intercourse of domestic life.” p. viii.

Lord Camelford was worthy of such a preceptor: his noble correspondent was not mistaken in his disposition and character. ‘Suavity of manners,’ and ‘steadiness of principle,’ ‘correctness of judgement,’ and ‘integrity of heart,’ distinguished him through life.

Of some works, lord Chatham’s opinion does not accord with the sentiments generally entertained; but, instead of enlarging on this point, we shall add lord Grenville’s remarks, which are perfectly in unison with our own sentiments.

‘Some early impressions had prepossessed lord Chatham’s mind with a much more favourable opinion of the political writings of lord Bolingbroke, than he might himself have retained on a more impartial reconsideration. To a reader of the present day, the “Remarks on the History of England” would probably appear but ill entitled to the praises which are in these letters so liberally bestowed upon them. For himself, at least, the editor may be allowed to say, that their style is, in his judgement, declamatory, diffuse, and involved: deficient both in elegance and in precision, and little calculated to satisfy a taste formed, as lord Chatham’s was, on the purest models of classic simplicity. Their matter he thinks more substantially defective: the observations which they contain, display no depth of thought, or extent of knowledge; their reasoning is, for the most part, trite and superficial; while on the accuracy with which the facts themselves are represented no reliance can safely be placed. The principles and character of their author lord Chatham himself condemns, with just reprobation. And when, in addition to this general censure, he admits, that in these writings the truth of history is occasionally warped, and its application distorted for party purposes, what farther notice



can be wanted of the caution with which such a book must always be regarded?

‘Lord Chatham appears to have recommended to his nephew, at the same time, the study of a very different work, the history of Clarendon: but he speaks with some distrust of the integrity of that valuable writer. When a statesman traces, for the instruction of posterity, the living images of the men and manners of his time; the passions by which he has himself been agitated, and the revolutions in which his own life and fortunes were involved, the picture will doubtless retain a strong impression of the mind, the character, and the opinions of its author. But there will always be a wide interval between the bias of sincere conviction and the dishonesty of intentional misrepresentation.’ P. xv.

‘It will be obvious to every reader on the slightest perusal of the following letters, that they were never intended to comprise a perfect system of education, even for the short portion of time to which they relate. Many points in which they will be found deficient, were undoubtedly supplied by frequent opportunities of personal intercourse, and much was left to the general rules of study established at an English university. Still less therefore should the temporary advice addressed to an individual, whose previous education had laboured under some disadvantage, be understood as a general dissuasive from the cultivation of Grecian literature. The sentiments of lord Chatham were in direct opposition to any such opinion. The manner in which, even in these letters, he speaks of the first of poets, and the greatest of orators; and the stress which he lays on the benefits to be derived from their immortal works, could leave no doubt of his judgement on this important point. That judgement was afterwards most unequivocally manifested, when he was called upon to consider the question with a still higher interest, not only as a friend and guardian, but also as a father.

‘A diligent study of the poetry, the history, the eloquence, and the philosophy of Greece, an intimate acquaintance with those writings which have been the admiration of every age, and the models of all succeeding excellence, would undoubtedly have been considered by him as an essential part of any general plan for the education of an English gentleman, born to share in the councils of his country. Such a plan must also have comprised a much higher progress, than is here traced out, in mathematics, in the science of reason, in natural, and in moral philosophy; including in the latter the proofs and doctrines of that revelation by which it has been perfected. Nor would the work have been considered by him as finished, until on these foundations there had been built an accurate knowledge of the origin, nature, and safeguards of government and civil liberty; of the principles of public and municipal law; and of the theory of political, commercial, financial, and military administration; as resulting from the investigations of philosophy, and as exemplified in the lessons both of ancient and of modern history.’ P. xxiv.

Criticism cannot be more just, can never be more candid,  
We resign then the rod to the editor, with the most thorough

acquiescence in his opinions. It remains only to add, from the work, a few specimens of the correspondence, with which we have been greatly delighted. The following passage may be of singular utility even to those who have already passed their boyhood.

‘ You are already possessed of the true clue to guide you through this dangerous and perplexing part of your life’s journey, the years of education; and upon which, the complexion of all the rest of your days will infallibly depend: I say you have the true clue to guide you, in the maxim you lay down in your letter to me, namely, that the use of learning is, to render a man more wise and virtuous; not merely to make him more learned. *Macte tuâ virtute*; go on, my dear boy, by this golden rule, and you cannot fail to become every thing your generous heart prompts you to wish to be, and that mine most affectionately wishes for you. There is but one danger in your way; and that is, perhaps, natural enough to your age, the love of pleasure, or the fear of close application and laborious diligence. With the last there is nothing you may not conquer: and the first is sure to conquer and enslave whoever does not strenuously and generously resist the first allurements of it, lest by small indulgencies, he fall under the yoke of irresistible habit. *Vitanda est improba Siren, Desidia*, I desire may be affixed to the curtains of your bed, and to the walls of your chambers. If you do not rise early, you never can make any progress worth talking of; and another rule is, if you do not set apart your hours of reading, and never suffer yourself or any one else to break in upon them, your days will slip through your hands, unprofitably and frivolously; unpraised by all you wish to please, and really unenjoyable to yourself. Be assured, whatever you take from pleasure, amusements, or indolence, for these first few years of your life, will repay you a hundred-fold, in the pleasures, honours, and advantages of all the remainder of your days.’ p. 10.

The course of study we do not find very objectionable, except in its order, and from a belief that some general familiar work on ontology should have been interposed between the course of logic and Locke on the Human Understanding.

‘ Pythagoras enjoined his scholars an absolute silence for a long noviciate. I am far from approving such a taciturnity: but I highly recommend the end and intent of Pythagoras’s injunction; which is to dedicate the first parts of life more to hear and learn, in order to collect materials, out of which to form opinions founded on proper lights, and well-examined sound principles, than to be presuming, prompt, and flippant in hazarding one’s own slight crude notions of things; and thereby exposing the nakedness and emptiness of the mind, like a house opened to company before it is fitted either with necessities, or any ornaments for their reception and entertainment. And not only will this disgrace follow from such temerity and presumption, but a more serious danger is sure to ensue, that is, the embracing errors for truths, prejudices for principles; and when that is once done, (no matter how vainly and weakly,) the adhering perhaps to false and dangerous notions, only because one has declared for

them, and submitting, for life, the understanding and conscience to a yoke of base and servile prejudices, vainly taken up and obstinately retained. This will never be your danger; but I thought it not amiss to offer these reflexions to your thoughts. As to your manner of behaving towards these unhappy young gentlemen you describe, let it be manly and easy; decline their parties with civility; retort their raillery with raillery, always tempered with good breeding; if they banter your regularity, order, decency, and love of study, banter in return their neglect of them; and venture to own frankly, that you came to Cambridge to learn what you can, not to follow what they are pleased to call pleasure. In short, let your external behaviour to them be as full of politeness and ease as your inward estimation of them is full of pity, mixed with contempt. I come now to the part of the advice I have to offer to you, which most nearly concerns your welfare, and upon which every good and honourable purpose of your life will assuredly turn; I mean the keeping up in your heart the true sentiments of religion. If you are not right towards God, you can never be so towards man: the noblest sentiment of the human breast is here brought to the test. Is gratitude in the number of a man's virtues? if it be, the highest benefactor demands the warmest returns of gratitude, love, and praise: *Ingratum qui dixerit, omnia dixit*. If a man wants this virtue where there are infinite obligations to excite and quicken it, he will be likely to want all others towards his fellow-creatures, whose utmost gifts are poor compared to those he daily receives at the hands of his never-failing Almighty Friend. Remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth, is big with the deepest wisdom: The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; and, an upright heart, that is understanding. This is eternally true, whether the wits and rakes of Cambridge allow it or not: nay, I must add of this religious wisdom, Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace, whatever your young gentlemen of pleasure think of a whore and a bottle, a tainted health and battered constitution. Hold fast therefore by this sheet-anchor of happiness, religion; you will often want it in the times of most danger; the storms and tempests of life. Cherish true religion as precious as you will fly with abhorrence and contempt superstition and enthusiasm. The first is the perfection and glory of the human nature; the two last the depravation and disgrace of it. Remember the essence of religion is, a heart void of offence towards God and man; not subtle speculative opinions, but an active vital principle of faith. r. 22.

We have dwelt with more pleasure on these passages, to show the wittings of the day, that a deep heartfelt sense of religion is not inconsistent with genius and learning, the most acute comprehension and the profoundest judgement.

Once more.

'As to the use of the sword, it is well to know it: but remember, my dearest nephew, it is a science of defence: and that a sword can never be employed by the hand of a man of virtue, in any other cause. As to the carriage of your person, be particularly careful, as you are tall and thin, not to get a habit of stooping; nothing has so poor a

look : above all things avoid contracting any peculiar gesticulations of the body, or movements of the muscles of the face. It is rare to see in any one a graceful laughter ; it is generally better to smile than laugh out, especially to contract a habit of laughing at small or no jokes. Sometimes it would be affectation, or worse, mere moroseness, not to laugh heartily, when the truly ridiculous circumstances of an incident, or the true pleasantry and wit of a thing, call for and justify it ; but the trick of laughing frivolously is by all means to be avoided : *Risu inepto, res ineptior nulla est.* Now as to politeness ; many have attempted definitions of it : I believe it is best to be known by description ; definition not being able to comprise it. I would however venture to call it, benevolence in trifles, or the preference of others to ourselves in little daily, hourly, occurrences in the commerce of life. A better place, a more commodious seat, priority in being helped at table ; &c. what is it, but sacrificing ourselves in such trifles to the convenience and pleasure of others ? And this constitutes true politeness. It is a perpetual attention, (by habit it grows easy and natural to us), to the little wants of those we are with, by which we either prevent, or remove them. Bowing, ceremonious, formal compliments, stiff civilities, will never be politeness : that must be easy, natural, unstudied, manly, noble. And what will give this, but a mind benevolent, and perpetually attentive to exert that amiable disposition in trifles towards all you converse and live with ? Benevolence in greater matters takes a higher name, and is the queen of virtues. Nothing is so incompatible with politeness as any trick of absence of mind. I would trouble you with a word or two more upon some branches of behaviour, which have a more serious moral obligation in them, than those of mere politeness ; which are equally important in the eye of the world. I mean a proper behaviour, adapted to the respective relations we stand in, towards the different ranks of superiors, equals, and inferiors. Let your behaviour towards superiors, in dignity, age, learning, or any distinguished excellence, be full of respect, deference, and modesty. Towards equals, nothing becomes a man so well as well-bred ease, polite freedom, generous frankness, manly spirit, always tempered with gentleness and sweetness of manner, noble sincerity, candour, and openness of heart, qualified and restrained within the bounds of discretion and prudence, and ever limited by a sacred regard to secrecy, in all things entrusted to it, and an inviolable attachment to your word. To inferiors, gentleness, condescension, and affability, is the only dignity. Towards servants, never accustom yourself to rough and passionate language. When they are good we should consider them as *humiles amici*, as fellow Christians, *ut conservi* ; and when they are bad, pity, admonish, and part with them if incorrigible. On all occasions beware, my dear child, of Anger, that dæmon, that destroyer of our peace.

*Ira furor brevis est, animum rege qui nisi paret*

*Imperat, hunc frænis hunc tu compesce catenis.* p. 34.

The verses in these volumes are not divided, but printed as prose, probably as they were in the letters. May we hence suppose that lord Chatham was unacquainted with, or in,

different to, the rules of prosody? It was more probably accidental.

We cannot add any thing to what we have said, in commendation of the work, and we can only recommend to the rising generation to imprint every letter in their minds.

**ART. XIII.**—*A Voyage in the Indian Ocean and to Bengal, undertaken in the Years 1789 and 1790: containing an Account of the Sechelles Islands and Trincomale; the Character and Arts of the People of India; with some remarkable religious Rites of the Inhabitants of Bengal. To which is added, a Voyage in the Red Sea; including a Description of Mocha, and of the Trade of the Arabs of Yemen; with some Particulars of their Manners, Customs, &c. Translated from the French of L. De Grandpré. With Engravings, and a View of the Citadel of Calcutta. 2 Vols. 8vo. 15s. Boards. Robinsons. 1803.*

SUCH is the intimate connexion of this country with Hindustan, so jealous are our enemies of the power we have obtained in the East, that every publication on this subject must be interesting, and from a Frenchman peculiarly so. We have very lately seen in the *Moniteur*, the organ of consular dictation, that our eastern acquisitions give peculiar pangs to the French government. The conquests of Russia in Persia, and of England in Hindustan, are there represented as not inferior to many of the united kingdoms of Europe. We know not whether this be true; but we *do know* that what we before held was insecure without these additions, and that, at present, European plans and intrigues are much less likely to produce any disastrous effects than at a former period. M. Grandpré's object was a commercial one; and his representations are not devoid of candour, though a little of French jealousy is occasionally conspicuous.

One of his first descriptions is that of the Sechelles Islands, a group to the north of the Isle of France, either formed by the eddy of a current from the south, or the projecting points of a larger island, now covered by the sea. The shallows around lead us to the former system. We shall select M. Grandpré's description and opinions.

‘ Among this group of islands some are nothing more than barren rocks; but four of them, Mayé, St. Anne, Praslin, and Frégates, contain water, and are capable of cultivation. Mahé is the principal and largest, and is about five leagues in circumference. It is of a secondary height, that is to say, upwards of a thousand feet, as I guessed at least, for I had no time to make exact observations. The whole island is a continued mountain, having several peaks without any considerable vallies between them. It is primitive or granitic,



and the bare sides of the peaks, rising perpendicularly, discover, in many places, granite in its purity.

‘ This mountain, as well as those the tops of which compose the other islands, have undoubtedly served as a resting-place, against which the ocean, gradually depositing its sediments, has formed the bank that surrounds them; and they will therefore, in a course of time, be united, in all probability, into one island.

‘ Let us for a moment attend here to the physical changes of the globe, and the gradual organisation of banks and masses from materials which the sea heaps together in her bosom. The form of the Sechelles’ bank appears to furnish matter for reflexion on the subject. If we remark, that the currents in the track of the general winds always follow the impulse of those winds, that is here, always run to the north-west, we shall easily conceive, that these peaks of granite, uniting together at the base at a certain depth, have collected, for a long succession of ages, all the loose matter and extraneous bodies which the waves and tides have thrown in their way: driven against the south-west points of these peaks, these materials have been stopped there, and have formed the bank above which the Sechelles Islands rise:

‘ To this it will perhaps be objected, that some islands have their anchorage to leeward, as, for instance, the Isles of France and Bourbon, and those of St. Helena and Ascension, where no soundings are found to windward, and which have all a small bank on the opposite side to the current. The answer is simple: these islands are volcanic. The Isle of France bears such evident vestiges of an eruption, that lava is found at every step. That of Bourbon is burning at present; the peak of Salazes is a volcano; and St. Helena still exhibits the traces of flames on her mountains. As to Ascension, its conflagration is so recent, that its soil is nothing but ashes; it has not yet had time to recover its springs, and a drop of water is accordingly not to be found through the whole island.

‘ Whether these islands are the wreck of a mutilated continent, or have been thrown up by a submarine explosion, which I should rather admit, their formation has been accompanied by accidents that have given cause for the accumulation of the banks in question, which have no relation whatever to those gradually organised by the sea. These islands are too new for the ocean to have had time to throw up against them the materials, which form shelves and masses accumulated in the silence of ages.

‘ The bank which surrounds the Sechelles extends a considerable distance to leeward; but nothing can thence be concluded against what I have advanced. For this fact to subvert my theory, it would be necessary that the isle of Mahé should be alone; whereas it is comprised in an archipelago situated in the midst of two others still more extensive, and at no great distance apart. It is evident, that at various depths, never very considerable, these islands are all joined together at the base, from the northern extremity of the Laccadives even to the Isles of France and Bourbon. The mountains of this continent form the islands that are perceptible and known to us; and many others must exist, that, from their want of elevation, are condemned to remain submerged. The isle of Mahé is surrounded

by tops of this kind, which, unable to rise above the waves, have only intercepted the materials dragged on by the ocean in its course: they are now covered, and form the bank, the figure of which answers to their situation. It is probable, that the leeward part of the Sechelles' bank will not be left dry till long after that to windward; because the currents, having now no obstacle opposed to them, carry off with them into the immensity of the deep the extraneous bodies which escape from the islands of this archipelago; while, on the contrary, the isle of Mahé and the rest, opposing a barrier to the tides, force them to deposit the sediments they contain on the point of resistance. This hypothesis is proved almost to evidence; for the bank of the Sechelles is elevated considerably to windward, so that we find only a very small depth of water in the direct line of the tides, that is to say, to the south-east, and this depth must necessarily diminish daily. In short, if any thing can give weight to my conjecture, it is, that the harbour of the Sechelles very sensibly becomes shallower, as does that also of the Isle of France: which demonstrates, not only that the ocean collects in those places the extraneous bodies by which they are organised, but also, that its easy and gradual retreat takes place in these climates in the same uniform manner as our philosophers have remarked in other parts of the globe.\* Vol. i. p. 4.

Our author has not taken into the account one cause of the formation of this land—*viz.* the accumulation of coral banks, of which we suspect a great part of these islands consists. The spice-trees, which were carried thither, and which, though they dwindled in the Mauritius, flourished in the valleys of the Sechelles, were destroyed on the suspicion of the arrival of an English force. Some accidental trees, however, sown by birds, have appeared, though not in great numbers. The soil is in general fertile; but horned cattle do not thrive in it. Indigo and rice, goats and pigs, flourish and improve in these islands. The turtle, from the facts recorded by our author, seems occasionally to make voyages of no inconsiderable extent.

M. Grandpré, after appearances and adventures not new or unusual to navigators in those seas, arrives in India, at Pondicherry, and gives an abstract of the well-known history of French politics on the Asiatic continent. His account is brought down to the period of his arrival in 1790; and our readers' memory will easily supply the continuation. His history of the commerce of India is by no means new or interesting; the observations on the situation, &c. of Trincomale, are, at this time, of more importance.

\* Trincomale presents one of those striking traits which characterise the genius of a nation. In the hands of an active and energetic government, it would have become an impregnable fortress. It might have secured to its masters the possession of the whole coast of Coromandel, from which it is distant only twenty-four hours sail; it would have served as a rallying point, both against the powers of

India and those of Europe; it would have been an arsenal whence they might have derived every means of attack and defence in the peninsula; and its harbours and road would have admitted of a formidable naval establishment: in a word, Trincomale, in the possession of an enterprising nation, might have become the capital of India. Calcutta, which now enjoys that pre-eminence, is situated much less favourably for war.

'Instead of feeling these advantages, the Dutch contented themselves with making it a small post just capable of defending them from any slight attack. Nature held out to them the means of rendering it a second Gibraltar; for by building a large citadel on the top of the mountain it would have been rendered inaccessible. This mountain is so steep as to be nearly perpendicular on every side; it is formed like a tortoise, and would admit of a very extensive town. By digging wells in the rock, water would have been found in abundance; it might have contained magazines of provisions for the service of a year or more; from its height it would have been sheltered from the *ricochet* and enfilade; and, in short, would have protected so effectually the back bay, that it might have blown to atoms any fleet daring enough to cast anchor in it. Instead of adopting a plan like this, the first settlers, struck with the facility of barring the isthmus of which I have spoken, and of entrenching themselves at the foot of the mountain against the natives of the country, imagined they could do nothing better than construct in haste a front fortification; and even in doing this they followed a defective method, then in vogue, and which was merely sufficient to defend them against the blacks of Candy. This work, very solidly built of stone, must have cost a considerable sum of money; and when the Europeans at length became rivals in the seas of India, and had a mutual wish to dispossess each other, the Dutch company, actuated by petty mercantile views, adhered to it from avarice. If they were to alter the system of defence, and establish themselves on the mountain, what had already been expended would be wholly lost; and they sacrificed every thing to so trifling a consideration. They continued, as well as they could, to meliorate their actual situation, and were far from wishing to form an expensive establishment, whilst the one in question was not only already completed, but also required, from the nature of the fortification, only very small means for its defence and support. Such a system of economy was clear gain in the eyes of a people, who, extending their views no further than the mechanism of trade, consider details merely without looking to important results. Hence, notwithstanding all that nature had done to render it celebrated, the port of Trincomale was condemned, from the insensibility of its masters, to remain in obscurity.' Vol. i. p. 61.

The remarks on the chief fortifications of the island are apparently judicious, and, at this period, interesting: but, for these, we must refer to the work, as well as for the nautical description, the advantages, and inconveniences, of the harbour. The misery of its masters, the Dutch, was extreme.

M. Grandpré returns to India, and, from the shallowness of the coast, conjectures that the land has been gained, at no very distant period, from the sea. In time, he supposes that even

Ceylon may be joined to the continent: yet he candidly adds an account of some very ancient buildings near the coast, in a low situation, and, what is remarkable, some traces of Grecian architecture in its greatest purity. The author's subsequent hypothesis of the sea retiring till the Mauritius and Maldives, &c., as far as the islands of St. Peter and St. Paul (for so far he thinks the chain of granitic rocks evidently extends) shall become a part of the continent of Asia, is too extravagant to become the object of our remarks. The speculations on the different races of men are also too hypothetical. Our author supposes that Asia, Africa, and America, have their distinct races, and that the varieties of the Asiatic race, spreading to Europe, are the effects of climate only. The Albinos he seems to think a different family, perhaps a different species. The description of Indian manners and customs needs not detain us, as the subject is sufficiently known. Yet our author's familiar manner is pleasing; and, if we mistake not, he has made some additions to the accounts of former travellers. The military transactions, by which all the possessions of the French in India came under the dominion of England, and their good ally, Tippoo, lost both his crown and life, are shortly dispatched. M. Grandpré seems to flatter himself that they may be regained, or that the English power may be destroyed by fomenting jealousies among the native princes, or by a fortunate reconciliation between the Hindus and their Mohammedan conquerors; but even these expectations must be now at an end. An account of the former French possessions in India follows.

Our author next proceeds to Madras, which he describes, as well as its trade, and the principal powers of the peninsula. To the Mahrattas he gives all the honour of conquering Tippoo. He next proceeds to Calcutta, which he also describes; but his account contains no particular information of novelty or interest. M. Grandpré does not formally reject the authenticity of the Sanscrit works which we have received; on the contrary, he expressly admits them to be genuine, but adds, in the strongest terms, the improbability of the Bramins communicating their sacred works, which must be attended with the loss of their cast, a disgrace to them worse than death. We believe the best Oriental scholars begin to hesitate respecting the authenticity of some of the pundits' communications, though there can be little doubt of our having received many genuine works. At present the difficulty is where to draw the line; to ascertain what we should certainly reject, and what we may safely retain. Of the Bramins however, it should be remarked, that many are in low stations, that their communications may be concealed, or that, among the number to whom such works are entrusted, it would be difficult to fix the breach of confidence. Some account of the productions, the manufactures, and the religious ceremonies, of Bengal is subjoined.

The country round Bengal is, like that in the peninsula, flat: not a calcareous stone, not an atom of granite, is found till at a great distance from the sea. M. Grandpré supposes, with great reason, that it has been lately abandoned by the sea. New islands are constantly rising; but these, we think, are produced by causes, which, though common, he does not suspect, *viz.*; the accumulation of sand from the river meeting the opposing ocean. If the great antiquity of the Hindoos be admitted, they could not, of course, be aborigines of this comparatively new country. In fact, they are not the original inhabitants of India, but migrated thither from the north-west.

M. Grandpré next takes the command of a ship, laden with grain for the coast of Malabar, but is, in every respect, unfortunate. He stops at Cochin on this coast, for repairs. It was, at that time, a Dutch settlement; and our author gives a short description of it. At Cochin, meeting with treacherous information, he carries his cargo to Mocha.

In this part of the work we find an apparently faithful picture of the Arabian coast and Arabian manners, but we think, on the whole, that there are no very considerable additions to what we have been told by other travellers, particularly by Bruce and Niebuhr. The following account of the Bannians, however, is more minute and interesting than we have seen in any former work.

‘ Besides that of the Jews, another strange cast is tolerated here even in the town itself: these are the Bannians. Of all the variety of religions, sects, societies, and casts which exist, that of the Bannians, beyond contradiction, is the one that does most honour to humanity. In the exercise of the social virtues they have no parallel. One of their chief precepts, as is well known, is to love every thing that breathes, to assist every thing that is in pain, to abhor the spilling of blood, and to abstain from food that has enjoyed life; and they practise this precept in its utmost rigour. Nothing can induce them to take any other nourishment than milk, butter, cheese, rice, and vegetables.’ Vol. ii. P. 178.

‘ Their dress is a white robe and a rose coloured turban; the different tribes of animals know them so well, that the pigeons are often extremely troublesome, and no bird ever flies away to avoid them. I have never seen a Bannian take any bird, though I have seen instances of their feeding them on the bushes; though I have seen them scatter rice at their feet, and the birds, wild to other men, flock round and tranquilly pick it up, like so many poultry in a farm yard. In short, the most timid animals approach them without the least apprehension; and the most successful mode of hunting would certainly be in the disguise of a Bannian, were it possible so flagrantly to abuse the confidence which the amiable manners of this cast have gained them.

‘ Their horror at every thing dead can hardly be described. One of them, named Ramji, came often to my house at the time of my meals to give an account of some business or other he had transacted



for me. When any of my people wished to play him a trick, they contrived that a little broiled fish should fall as by accident upon his hand. The poor fellow upon this would cry out as in an agony, and run to wash himself with an eagerness and care, that could only be equalled by the terror he felt at the circumstance. The flies in all hot countries are eager for drink, and are very often drowned in the dishes and glasses. Ramji would willingly have spent a whole day in restoring one of these insects to life. A method was pointed out to him of putting them into salt to recover them; and he was so overjoyed at the discovery, that he never came to me afterwards without a handkerchief full of salt, to save the lives of as many as he could. These marks of character, though trifling, may serve to depict the extraordinary good-nature and sweetness of manners of these people.

‘ Their disposition is frank and open: a Bannian is ignorant of prevarication and falsehood. The whole commerce of the Europeans is entrusted to them, they alone being able to deal with the Arabs. What they receive for their trouble is extremely moderate, yet are their probity and honour proof against every temptation.’ Vol. ii. p. 180.

The manners of the Arabs are described at length; but a little apparent inconsistency arises from the author's not always distinguishing the peculiarities of the wilder Arabs from those who are more civilised. The following picture of their commercial transactions is singular.

‘ The strictness of manners of the Arabs must necessarily influence the national character: accordingly no people are more frank, open, and sincere: even the wandering tribes are never known to break their word. The Arab gives no note nor written obligation; neither bond nor security is necessary to bind him to the performance of what he has promised. Two merchants conclude a bargain without speaking a word; the one touches the hand of the other, and a third spreads a carpet over them; the touching of hands determines the price that is agreed upon, and nothing can break an engagement entered into in this manner. If several deal together they sit down in a circle; the seller sets his price by squeezing the hand of his neighbour on his right side a certain number of times; and such as intend to offer a greater or less price for the goods, augment or diminish the number of these tokens accordingly. The person on the left of the seller signifies the price which has thus come round to him; he who first gave it makes himself known, the buyer and seller give each other the hand, which a third party separates with a slight blow, and the bargain is so firmly concluded, that it cannot be broken. I have witnessed transactions of this nature. It is an established rule, that a vessel shall not dispose of any of her goods without giving notice to the body of merchants, who are entitled to the preference: the owner is obliged to resign at least a part of his cargo, if he does not sell it all to them, before he disposes of it partially. On such occasions they assemble together and treat in silence, the hand under the carpet: the bargain is concluded without any dispute, any ill-will, and without even a word being spoken, and the engagement is irrevocable.

\* Such good faith and honesty ought to confound our Europeans, who deem themselves superior to all other nations, yet can settle no business, however trivial, without guarding against the possibility of mutual fraud, by a multitude of forms, dictated by mistrust, and which are often insufficient to protect the creditor from the dishonest practices of the debtor.' Vol. ii. p. 247.

Attached to their religion and their manners, the Arabs have no reason to fear any revolution; but we cannot think with the author, that Arabia will ever attain any rank among the foremost nations of the earth.

\* Arabia without doubt can boast of having been peopled at as remote a period as any part of the globe. The high mountains of granite prove the antiquity of the country. At the first view of it in a map, it appears to have been an island in the primitive ages of the world, before the existence of the isthmus of Suez, and when the Persian Gulf joined the Caspian Sea. Since that time its extent has continually increased; and in the lapse of some centuries, the Straits of Bab-el-mandel will probably be a second point of contact between Africa and Asia. There is already but seven fathom water between the isthmus of Mehun or Perim, which is the usual passage of vessels. There is a depth indeed of four-and-twenty fathoms in the wider passage, but this depth is confined to the middle only, and is found no where else; in many parts, the sands and the high bottoms prevent large vessels from passing. The Red Sea is deeper than the narrow strait, and is almost every where, between the islands and rocks which it contains, thirty or forty fathom. Many parts of it are even said to be unfathomable; but this must be owing to the imperfection of the lines used in sounding; and, I am persuaded, that hereafter it will be a large lake like the Caspian Sea, when time shall have shut up the strait.' Vol. ii. p. 254.

\* In attempting to calculate the ages that might elapse before the ocean will have quitted the coast of Arabia opposite Aden, the powers of the mind would be lost: while, as to the Red Sea, its water is so shallow, the islands and sand-banks with which it abounds are so evidently the tops of hills that are slowly appearing, and its retreat is so visible, that we cannot refuse to anticipate in imagination a period at which this vast gulf will be converted into a valley. It is even possible, that this chance may be accelerated by some volcanic explosion. The enormous mass which constitutes the mountains of Arabia rests upon no solid basis. An internal conflagration has excavated beneath their foundations immense caverns, which, passing under the bed of the Red Sea, communicate with Africa. The little island of Gebel-thor still burns and smokes, from the effects of these volcanic processes.' Vol. ii. p. 258.

The introduction of volcanoes in this passage is superfluous: the country is not volcanic; and the island mentioned is a solitary and independent instance. Volcanoes and earthquakes, though perhaps not very distant in their causes, are not always connected: though volcanic explosions are generally accompa-

nied by earthquakes, the contrary is very rare. Some of the subsequent geographic remarks must be read in the work itself: they are curious, but not important. M. Grandpré thinks that the island Panchaia, mentioned by Diodorus, must have been destroyed by some subterraneous explosion, since the sea is rather retiring than gaining on the land, and there are no traces of these mountainous points on the neighbouring continent. We cannot now enlarge on this subject. We suspect that he has looked for the ruins of the temple of Jupiter where they never existed; but even admitting all his suppositions, it is no very improbable hypothesis that the distinguishing features of the spot may have been obscured by the overwhelming sands.

Our author returns, after a very dangerous navigation, to India, where he witnesses the distressing scenes of famine, and gives an interesting account of the calm fortitude with which the blameless Hindu meets the stroke of death. The method also, by which the Indian shipwrights careen their vessels without the assistance of any machine, is particularly curious. The labour is immense: but this is of little consequence where the daily labour of eighty men can be obtained for two shillings; and on a stipend thus small, can the abstemious Hindu procure subsistence for a family.

The translation of this work is peculiarly neat and correct, without aiming at elegance or ornament. In general, it is more concise than the original; and we suspect that it is the work of a seaman. No other, we think, would have translated *chavira*, 'capsize,' overset. The plates are not numerous, and are, on the whole, inferior in execution to those of the original.

## MONTHLY CATALOGUE.

### POLITICS.

ART. 14.—*A Letter to the Right Honourable William Pitt, on the present State of his political Experiment.* 8vo. 2s. Budd. 1804.

This is a warm expostulation with Mr. Pitt, for having assumed the sole management of public affairs at a time when a combination of the greatest and most popular talents in the country seemed ready to gratify the wishes of the people, by supplying the place of Mr. Addington's inefficient administration. The author thinks, that, when Mr. Pitt placed himself at the head of the cabinet, to the exclusion

of such men as lord Grenville, Mr. Windham, Mr. Fox, and Mr. Grey, he had more consideration of private feeling than of public and national objects. This may be true: but we are not told expressly what was Mr. Pitt's choice of evils; nor is he accused of creating, although he certainly acquiesced in, the new and very unexpected arrangements. The origin of such a measure must be sought elsewhere, in some track which our author has not thought proper to pursue. He proposes, however, a mode of resolving the problem that now perplexes the public, which some of Mr. Pitt's admirers will be glad to adopt. He considers Mr. Pitt's conduct as a 'political experiment,' and states that 'there are strong grounds for believing that the experiment Mr. Pitt has chosen to try, was decidedly contrary to his own opinion; but that the reducing it to practice was the only mode left him to prove its inefficacy, and to confirm the validity of his own sentiments.' He advises the minister, therefore, to state to his sovereign that the experiment has failed, and to recommend a government more comprehensive of great talents. We shall not weigh the probability of Mr. Pitt's taking this advice, but in the mean time he can have no reason to complain that he has not been treated with due respect by the writer of this pamphlet, who, among many causes for censure, finds some for praise, and never departs from the urbanity of a fair opponent.

ART. 15.—*An Essay on the political Relations between Russia and France. With Remarks by the Translator, H. F. Greville, Esq.* 8vo. 2s. 6d. Ginger. 1804.

Monsieur Tinseau, the author of this essay, has very ably demonstrated the dangers which menace Europe from the power, and perhaps yet more from the intrigues, of Bonaparte; but the proposed remedy—an efficient confederacy—is what appears to us very impracticable, or at least at a great distance. In the mean time, however, our young statesmen may profit much by studying the geographic details of this well-informed writer, a branch of knowledge in which some of them are lamentably deficient. The translator's preface and notes are calculated to diminish the fears excited by M. Tinseau's statement, yet without denying that there is every ground for caution and vigour. The weakest of his arguments is perhaps that which is derived from the unpopularity of Bonaparte. He may be unpopular: but there is not a single symptom of *practical* disaffection in the whole compass of his extended dominions; and, while he can cajole Prussia, Spain, &c. and keep Great Britain so entirely on the defensive, that she can by no exertions disturb the internal tranquillity of France, the people there will not be very anxious to inquire into the rectitude of his measures, since they procure to them a longer respite from the recent horrors of the revolution. But even if his popularity were to end, as that of some of his tyrannical predecessors has ended, by whom and by what are he and his government to be succeeded? On the whole, therefore, we feel more disposition to be affected by M. Tinseau's statement, than by Mr. Greville's consolations.

ART. 16.—*Facts better than Arguments: in a Letter to the Right Honourable William Windham. From a Volunteer. 8vo. 4s. sewed. Ginger. 1804.*

This is an elaborate vindication of Mr. Addington's administration, and, although it had hitherto escaped our notice, appears to have been published when he was in place. The subject, however, has now lost much of its importance; and, while we concede to the author many of the arguments he has advanced in defence of that administration, when compared with the preceding, yet we can see no great propriety, and certainly no great consistency, in dividing their respective merits so widely. We cannot forget that Mr. Addington and his colleagues were Mr. Pitt's subalterns, and that what was wrong in Mr. Pitt's measures was as much their blame, as any measure of their own administration can be their praise. As to Mr. Windham, to whom our author's asperities are more particularly addressed, he appears to have been selected merely upon account of his dislike of that system of national defence to which the 'Volunteer' belongs. On this subject, therefore, we expected novelty and vigour, and have not been wholly disappointed: but the instances of successful volunteer exertions, taken from the histories of America, France, Switzerland, &c. do not appear to us quite in point. At the same time we are clearly of opinion that Mr. Windham has *proved* nothing against the volunteers, and that, as an unmilitary man, his *assertions* ought to be allowed very little weight: still less credit does he deserve as a statesman, if we recollect that the volunteer system originated with his own administration, and, although it consisted comparatively of a mere handful of men, was yet the constant theme of ministerial applause.—With respect to his having since accepted a commission in the present volunteer army, we do not rank it among his inconsistencies, because it may be his object to confirm the strongest argument we have ever heard advanced against the volunteers, namely, that they are *miserably officered*!

ART. 17.—*Nine Letters on Military Subjects, published in the True-Briton, in the Year 1803. Dedicated, by Permission, to his Royal Highness, Frederick Duke of York. By the Rev. William Martin Trinder, LL. B. at Oxford, and M. D. at Leyden. 8vo. 1s. 6d. Dwyer. 1804.*

Military subjects seem to be those on which every man is thought competent to give an opinion. Statesmen and lawyers have long edified the public by their systems of war, and plans of defence; and we have now a divine and a physician who is so little fatigued with the reciprocal cures of soul and body, as to enter on the minutest arrangements of the art military. Surely, if there be safety 'in a multitude of counsellors,' Britain ought not to despair. The advice, however, which this author gives on the properest method of preserving the health of the troops, appears to us the most important part of his pamphlet; and we are greatly mistaken if he be not himself of the same opinion. In p. 46, he refers his readers to an improvement in 'the air-bath, according to directions in a pamphlet, entitled *The English Olive Tree, which*' (the bath or the pamphlet?) 'because of its great



usefulness, more especially in the army and navy, no military man should be without. The manual exercise recommended in this book, or to *Trinderise* (as some persons choose to term it, from the name of the author) is the surest way to preserve health, &c. &c.'

ART. 18.—*A serious and impartial Address, to all the Independent Electors of the United Kingdoms, upon the recent Middlesex Election; in which the Proceedings and Transactions of that extraordinary Event are candidly and constitutionally discussed and investigated; the fatal Tendency and destructive Consequences of such a Precedent considered; and the whole viewed as a grand National Cause, in which that most invaluable Privilege, the Elective Franchise, and the Representative System itself, are most intimately involved. By Walter Honeywood Yate, Esq. an Independent Freeholder of the Counties of Gloucester and Worcester. 8vo. 2s. Longman and Rees. 1804.*

This is one of the most incoherent pieces of declamation that have fallen in our way since the memorable election which it has selected as its subject. The author, indeed, is so rapt in ecstasy on contemplating the high privilege of the elective franchise, and the dangers of corruption, that he has overlooked the only question before the public; and has so totally lost sight of 'the proceedings and transactions' of the Middlesex election, that, if his readers had no better information, they could never be able to comprehend what had happened, what had been determined, or what was now disputed. The author, we may add, is either a very young man with little judgement, or an old man with a frail memory; otherwise he never would have launched forth into such extravagant praises of 'the ever-independent and patriotic Wilkes,' the most unprincipled impostor that ever disgraced the profession of patriotism, and who, for his apostasy, was discarded, with contempt, a few years ago, by the very men who lately voted for sir Francis Burdett. Yet Mr. Yate assures the electors that sir Francis has 'equal claims, if not greater, to their applause and gratitude.'

## RELIGION.

ART. 19.—*A Discourse on the Duties which Britons owe, especially in the present eventful Crisis, to themselves, their King, and their Country: particularly addressed to the Castor, Alesworth, Upton and Sutton loyal Company of Volunteer Infantry. By the Rev. C. Hodgson, LL. B. &c. 8vo. 1s. Longman and Rees. 1804.*

Mr. Hodgson manifests himself to be a zealous clergyman and a vigilant magistrate, eager to serve his country, and to set an example of loyalty, in one and the other capacity. He selects, with much judgement, the example of the prophet Nehemiah, and handles his subject in such a manner as shows him to be a man of no mean abilities. But he has given way to an unfortunate inclination of catching at conceits and childish trifles. No sooner is the text named ['In what place ye hear the sound of the trumpet, &c.'] but his fanciful humour reminds him of the appropriation of this instrument to the dragoon service. 'The reader, if he please,' says he, 'may amuse his imagination by supposing the text to be a patriotic admonition from the cavalry to the infantry.'

Whether from a little share of pride in his office, or from a mistaken idea that the circumstance would give more consequence to his address, we know not, but the Minister is, all at once, absorbed in the Justice of peace: 'You have sworn BEFORE ME,' says Mr. Hodgson, and then recites the oath at full length even to the, *So help you God*. One would suppose that the orator had here brought civil authority to its climax, but *qui compte sans son hôte, compte deux fois*: 'You have pledged yourselves under your own signature on parchment' [be it known to our brother cockneys, that to subscribe parchment is a thing alarmingly solemn to a person of the country,] 'that in all cases of actual invasion, &c. &c.' and then follows a page and quarter of obligation, entered into by the good men of Castor, Alesworth, Upton and Sutton. The preacher, moreover, is not always scrupulous in his choice of words. *Debonair* is a little too finical to be applied to the habiliments of a soldier: and *grumblers*, for the discontented part of the people, is an appellation of too vulgar usage to be admitted into a sermon. We have praised and we have blamed this discourse, as its different parts required. Impartiality is the critic's chief attribute. Mr. Hodgson's loyalty yields to no man's: but his quaintness forces even muscles like ours to unbend themselves. After describing the horrors attendant on the successful invasion of this country by the French, he adds, 'Such a dreadful spectacle of national downfall would please the *little, unfeeling, Corsican tyrant more than all the activity and merriment of Sadler's Wells*.' By what strange accident, Mr. Hodgson, let us ask, did this unlucky sentence pop into *your worship's* fancy in so solemn an hour? and did not a smile at it, steal insensibly over the most serious face in your congregation? If *Grimaldi* and all *Sadler's Wells* together had united their powers for the purpose of exciting one, the effect, according to our opinion, could not have been more certain.

ART. 20.—*Reflexions on the Exercise of private Judgement in Matters of Religion:—A Discourse, delivered May 22, 1804, at Dudley, before the annual Assembly of dissenting Ministers, and published at their unanimous Request. By John Corrie. 8vo. 1s. 6d. Johnson, 1804.*

'I most sincerely hope that there is nothing in the following reflexions, which can afford just ground of offence, to persons whose opinions are most opposite to those of the author, and of the religious denomination to which he belongs. A certain degree of warmth, proportioned to our ideas of their importance, is the natural and necessary attendant of a serious declaration of our sentiments. Of this zeal it were disgraceful to be destitute; it is a generous and noble feeling; may it ever glow in the bosoms of my friends and in my own.' P. v.

This moderation is highly creditable to Mr. Corrie, as well as the ardour which accompanies it. The whole of the sermon is written in a pleasing style, and with a good deal of dispassionate calmness; and although we of the establishment do not accede to its author's sentiments, yet we bear testimony to the placid spirit manifested in his dissent.

'Will it be allowed,' says he, 'that it is the duty of every man to search the scriptures, to enlighten his understanding and to regulate his conduct by the purest light and the most secure guide: that to hold the truth as it is in Jesus, is what may be of great importance both in this world and another?—let then any one ask himself, which of two men, in other respects equally prepared, will institute this enquiry with the greater probability of success—he who is previously directed to frame his opinions by some fallible and human standard; he whom authority and interest must, from the very nature of mankind, both allure and deter; he to whom rank and fortune and honourable estimation are made dependent upon the adoption of certain previously-selected tenets: or he who, free from all merely human hopes or fears, advances under the sole guidance of an unbiassed understanding, and with the single view of humbly and conscientiously discharging what he esteems an important and a solemn duty?' p. 16.

On a revisal, Mr. Corrie and his dissenting brethren will find this ground not to be strictly tenable. Does interest, from its nature, allure mankind, and does authority deter them? How comes it to pass, then, that the body of dissenters resist interest and disobey authority? or how, that a man, bred in the church of England, and going to reside in a distant country where interest and authority support another persuasion, does not instantly adopt it? Because the authority that deters each, is not the authority of law or of establishment. 'Previously-selected tenets' are the sole authority that binds all alike; and but a mere few of any denomination—such perhaps, as, to great natural and acquired talents, have the happiness to unite a very honest mind—are exempt from them. Presbyterians and churchmen, unitarians and Calvinists, all feel the same authority of 'previously-selected tenets.' From their fathers they learned them; from their cradle they have looked upon them to be exclusively right; and in the scriptures they find texts, which they sincerely believe to authorise them. 'Unbiassed understanding,' in a sect, is a ridiculous assumption on the part of Mr. Corrie. Every man who believes in a future state, would at least have his faith right, although he might suffer his passions to warp his practice. Interest can bias the abandoned only. Establishments may aggrieve such as dissent from them, by depriving them of secular advantages, and may keep their numbers low, by expanding the stream of infant education in their own favour; but the honest mind, arrived at the age of mature judgement, will never, by their authority, be allured to enter their pale, or be deterred from quitting it.

ART. 21.—*The Importance of Education to the Christian Minister:—A Sermon, preached at George's Meeting-house, Exeter; June the 17th, 1804: in Recommendation of the Academical Institution in that City. By John Kentish. 8vo. 1s. Johnson. 1804.*

The candour that runs through the former article is again visible here. That spirit of rancour which formerly was exercised between the church and dissenters is greatly abated. May the spirit of charity continue to diminish it, till finally we become one fold under one shepherd! In point of literary worth, Mr. Corrie's sermon has much

the advantage of the present. Mr. Kentish's matter contains nothing new; and his manner of composition is not elegant.

ART. 22.—*A Sermon preached in the Parish Church of Cranbrook, in Kent, on Wednesday, the 19th of October, 1803, the Day appointed for a national Fast. By the Rev. D. W. Davies, B. A. &c. Published at the Request of the Congregation. 8vo. 6d. Sael and Co.*

The principal design of Mr. Davies, in this sermon, is very judicious. He does not pretend to decide, by arguments, upon the superiority of our navy; how far Bonaparte may be frustrated in his attempt to send his troops over; nor does he speculate on the contrariety of the winds for the furtherance of his descent. If we fancy ourselves secure, and remain inactive, we give him every encouragement to try the experiment: if we arm ourselves unanimously, he must see the prudence of staying at home. The religious exhortations that accompany these reflexions are solemn and appropriate.

ART. 23.—*A View of the Divine Goodness: presented to the Young, in a Lecture, designed principally for the Use of Sunday Schools. 12mo. 2d. Gurney. 1804.*

A plain discourse, well calculated to answer its purpose; and accompanied by some questions, suited to the examination of children, both as to faith and practice.

ART. 24.—*Words of Eternal Life, or the Catechism explained. On a new and familiar Plan. With Notes. Second Edition. By B. N. Turner, M. A. 8vo. 9d. Boards. Clarke. 1804.*

This is a very proper book to put into the hands of all children of our established church, prior to their confirmation. Mr. Turner explains the catechism in a way that they may well comprehend, and with great orthodoxy of opinion.

ART. 25.—*The unhappy Effects of Enthusiasm and Superstition. A Sermon, preached Wednesday, May 23, 1804, at the Annual Meeting, held in Church Street, Deptford. By J. Evans, A. M. Second Edition. To which are added, the Sentiments of the late William Cowper, Esq. and of the late Earl of Chatham, on the Subject of true Religion. 8vo. 1s. 6d. Symonds. 1804.*

Mr. Evans here presents the world with a practical discourse, which is very well worthy of their perusal. He chooses for the text—'God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.' As the title imports, it sets forth the unhappy effects of enthusiasm and superstition; and it depicts them so truly, that every reader will see the necessity of substituting for them that laudable zeal, of which they are perversions. The 'sentiments,' said to be annexed to the sermon, are only three short extracts from the writings of Mr. Cowper and the earl of Chatham.

#### DRAMA.

ART. 26.—*Britannicus, a Tragedy, in five Acts: translated from the French of Racine, with a Critical Preface, by Sir Brooke Boothby, Bart. 8vo. 2s. 6d. Stockdale. 1803.*

Most of the tragedies of Racine have found an entrance into the

English language, and two of them, Phædra and Andromache, an entrance upon the English stage, where they still occasionally maintain their appearance. Yet his *Britannicus*, although the first in point of dramatic merit, had hitherto been destitute of these honours. 'Si j'ai fait quelque chose,' says the poet himself in his original preface to it, 'de solide, et qui mérite quelque louange, la plupart des connoisseurs demeurent d'accord que c'est ce même *Britannicus*.' Sir Brooke has therefore been performing an acceptable task for the English reader: and, though the depravity of the times with respect to taste and feeling must prohibit all idea that his version will force its way into our theatres, we have no doubt that it will often find a welcome reception in our closets.

It is introduced by a long preface upon the subject of national taste, in which the ingenious baronet not only examines it with respect to poetry, but with regard also to painting and ornamental gardening. Upon this last topic, the following detached paragraph may not be altogether unworthy of notice.

'Brown, the late arbiter of taste in this branch, instead of following the eternal variety of nature, seems to have copied from a few general notions, so that there is much of manner and sameness in his works; and having prescribed, I suppose in compliance with the lordly ideas of *exclusion*, the village, the church, the parsonage, the mill, and all the moving scenery, they are for the most part dull and monotonous. When he had traced his serpentine water, with close-shaven banks, his mowed lawn, his clumpy plantations, and his winding road, he had nothing more. Almost every where, after skirting for a mile or two a pale or wall lined with his impenetrable belt, you come at last to an entrance, where a perverted road seems to lead any where rather than to the house in view; but which, after twisting and turning to shew this reach of water and that sweep of lawn, lands you at last at the front door, perhaps in no very good humour with your forced prospects and circuitous approach. The house stands alone: no shade, no gradation, no connexion; cropped of its necessary offices, which skulk behind, as if ashamed to be seen; and which, well united to the house, might have given extent and grandeur and the idea of utility to the whole. Poverty of resource masks what it cannot manage; genius encounters and vanquishes the difficulty. It is the completion of bad taste to endeavour to hide what cannot be concealed.' p. 16.

The following short philippic against German dramas is for the most part just, and deservedly severe.

'Modern Europe may be considered as forming a literary as well as a political republic. The principal languages are reciprocally much understood, and translation supplies the rest. The age of Louis XIV. was also the English Augustan age. At present our wretched novels infect the continent like an influenza; and the German dramas are the favourite representations on the Paris and London stages. These Germans, it must be confessed, have entered the lists of polite literature with unhappy auspices. The periods of the original imitations of nature, and those of the perfect works of art, were past; and



they begin where other nations have ended. They attempt their effects not by decorum, consent of parts, and agreement of character, but by their inversion. The hero of one of their dramatic *chef-d'œuvres* is the captain of a band of robbers; the heroine of another, the mother of a family, who has eloped from her husband and children; to follow her gallant; and, in a third, two delicate young ladies sentimentally agree to divide their man between them: and the merit of these pieces is designed to consist in their *indecenty*, *indecorum*, *impropriety*, *improbability*, *immorality*, and every other negation of reason and good taste. Such are the preposterous compositions, to which a facility of execution and a certain freshness of colouring have given a vogue, from which common sense and common decency turn away with disgust.

‘The favourite production of one of their most admired classics, in another line, is an epic poem in hexameter verse, the personages of which are mine host and hostess of the Golden Lion, their son, the maid of the inn, the parson, and the apothecary. The French translator of this work puts it in competition with the *Iliad*, which he has also translated.’ p. 20.

We now advance to the tragedy itself, which, so far as we have compared it with the original, is faithful and spirited. As a specimen of our translator’s style, we select the following scene from act I.

‘NERO, JUNIA.

‘*Nero*. Princess, you seem alarm’d. I should be griev’d  
My presence were the cause of your distress.

‘*Junia*. My Lord, I thought to find Octavia here.

‘*Nero*. I know you did, and therefore am I come.

Whate’er you think, Octavia is not here  
Your only friend.

‘*Junia*. Alas! my Lord, whom else  
Shall I implore, to learn what grievous crime  
I have, it seems, unknowingly committed?  
You, who ordain the punishment, perhaps  
Will condescend to explain the accusation.

‘*Nero*. Is it then nothing to have hid so long  
The beauties Heaven has lavish’d on that form?  
Was it for blest Britannicus alone  
To watch those opening graces day by day,  
And feel his passion with your charms increase?  
’T is said, indeed, that with complacency  
You listen to the moving tale he tells;  
But I will ne’er believe the rigid Junia  
Can condescend to authorize a love,  
Without my leave, illicit and clandestine.

‘*Junia*. My Lord, I know not why I should conceal  
That he has sometimes told me of his love.  
His generous sympathy has not disdain’d  
The last poor branch of an illustrious stem.  
He recollects, perhaps, the happier days,  
When ’t was his father’s pleasure to unite us.

He but obeys what Claudius had ordain'd,  
Confirm'd by Agrippina, nay, by you.

' *Nero*. What Claudius did, or Agrippina wills,  
Regards not me. I govern for myself.

Your marriage, Madam, is a state concern.

Prepare to take the husband I select.

' *Junia*. Alas! my Lord, who can that be?

' *Nero*. Myself.

' *Junia*. You!

' *Nero*. Had a greater name been found in Rome,

To him I might have given the precious prize;

But form'd to share the empire of the world,

To reign o'er every heart, Cæsar alone

Can bring an offering worthy of your charms.

When Claudius for his son designed your hand,

Heir to the empire he design'd him too.

The gods have otherwise decreed: but you

May still be seated on the imperial throne.

Nor let Octavia's claims alarm your virtue:

That barren marriage, disapprov'd by Heaven,

By Rome, the court, and me, must be dissolv'd.

' *Junia*. My Lord, you strike me with astonishment.

First, like a criminal I here am dragg'd;

And when I stand a culprit in your sight,

Scarce trusting in my conscious innocence,

You offer me Octavia's honour'd place.

Allow me, sir, to say, I neither merit

This rude affront, nor this excess of honour.

Can it be fitting that an orphan maid,

Who almost in her infancy beheld

Her race extinguish'd, and who since has liv'd

In the retirement suited to her state,

Should quit at once the still sequester'd shade,

To blaze in all the sunshine of a court?

Octavia fills with dignity the throne,

That my unpractis'd manners ill would suit.

' *Nero*. You have already heard my firm resolve

To break that marriage. Do but you agree,

And all the rest I take upon myself.

Recall the memory of your high descent,

And rather choose the noble gifts I offer,

Than the vain boast to have rejected them.

' *Junia*. Heaven knows my heart, that no vainglorious pride

Affects to scorn the honours you propose;

But more they have of dignity and grace,

More should I blush to rob the just possessor.

' *Nero*. Octavia's interests touch you nearly, Madam;

And generous friendship cannot farther go.

Such lofty sentiments might raise suspicion

Octavia's brother shared the noble flame.

' *Junia*. My Lord, I know not to disguise the truth,

Britannicus, I own, has gained my love.

Prudence, perhaps, would hold a different language.

CRIT. REV. Vol. 3. September, 1804. I

Remov'd from courts, I never yet have learnt  
 To feign false feelings, or conceal the true,  
 He, with the empire, was design'd for me :  
 And the misfortunes that he since has known,  
 His honours all abolish'd and revok'd,  
 His palaces deserted and forlorn,  
 His banish'd friends, and all his ruin'd hopes,  
 Are but new ties that bind me to his fate.  
 Serene, your days in varied pleasures roll,  
 And if some natural ills disturb your rest,  
 The world's employment is to sooth your pain.  
 Britannicus, forsaken and alone,  
 Has none but me to share his miseries ;  
 No consolation but my pitying tears,  
 That sometimes for a moment calm his woes.

' *Nero*. This consolation moves my envy, Madam :  
 Another with his life had paid these tears ;  
 But for Britannicus my love reserves  
 A gentler treatment. He shall see you, Princess.

' *Junia*. Your royal virtues still have calm'd my fears.

' *Nero*. Yes, he shall see you : but I warn you, Madam,  
 Britannicus's fate is in your hands.  
 Would you preserve his life, estrange him from you,  
 And let him not suspect me for the cause.  
 His banishment must seem to come from you ;  
 Whether in language you pronounce his doom,  
 Or more expressive silence and disdain,  
 Mark, he no longer must expect your love.

' *Junia*. Alas ! my Lord, could my false lips belie  
 The faith to him a thousand times they 've sworn,  
 My tears and faltering accents would betray me.

' *Nero*. Here, in concealment, the suspicious eye  
 Of jealousy will mark each look and gesture.  
 Princess, beware ! Britannicus's life  
 Depends on your compliance with my will.

' *Junia*. Rather, my Lord, permit me to retire,  
 And never see him more.' p. 55.

We observe that the scene with which, in the earlier copies, the third act opens, commencing as follows—

Quoi ! Narcisse, au palais obsédant l'empereur,  
 Laisse Britannicus en proie à sa fureur, &c.

is entirely omitted; while our translator has nevertheless re-introduced Junia into act v. scene 6., though in the later editions her appearance and address to Nero are dispensed with. We see no reason why both passages might not have been equally restored.

ART. 27.—*Guilty or not Guilty? a Comedy, in five Acts. First acted at the Theatre-Royal, Haymarket, May 26th, 1804. Written by Thomas Dibdin. 8vo. 2s. 6d. Lackington, Allen and Co. 1804.*

We feel pleasure in telling an author that he is in the road to improvement. The world [of writers, we mean] is fond of representing us as morose old fellows ; and credit is given to their complaint, be-

cause the public, in reading our animadversions, finds a much greater proportion of blame than commendation. But is the fault ours? We have undertaken the task of impartiality: how then shall we make praise preponderate, while nine in ten who scribble for the press merit only censure? This is not the case, however, with our author. The play before us is borrowed from a novel called 'The Reprobate:' but, though Mr. Dibdin has, on this account, little claim to invention, yet he has adapted the tale to representation in a very pleasing manner. The quirks and quibbles which so much disgrace modern dramas, and in which our author has also had his share, are not so thickly introduced in *Guilty or not Guilty*. Mr. Dibdin seems thankful, in his advertisement, for an introduction to Mr. Colman. We recommend him to an imitation of that gentleman's productions; for he is confessedly the best writer now in the habit of contributing to the stage. *Triangle* is a copy of *Lingo*, but he is a bad one. His author does not display much judgement in his character. Mr. Colman made *Lingo* a pedant, and laughed at his pedantry. *Triangle* is not drawn as a pedant, although as a man who teaches Greek and algebra, as well as minor school learning; yet Mr. Dibdin laughs at circles and angles as used by *Triangle*: but the laugh shows that he does not understand them. Had the case been otherwise, the character were not mended; for very few of the audience could have had the learning requisite for distinguishing whether his application of geometrical signs were pedantic or proper.

## NOVELS.

ART. 28.—*Brick Bolding; or, What is Life? An English, French, and Italian Romance. From the French of Pigault le Brun. 2 Vols. 12mo. 6s. Boards. Lane. 1804.*

An humorous introduction, in the grave ironical style of Swift, signed 'Translator,' informs us that, as 'my uncle Thomas' was supposed to satyrise the French revolution, so this work may, with equal justice, be considered as the life (*parce detorta*) of Bonaparte. Indeed each supposition is equally true—or rather equally absurd. With respect to the work itself, we can scarcely give it any character. We are so hurried along with the narrative, and dazzled with the quick succession of adventures, sudden changes of fortune, and hair-breadth 'scapes, that we have scarcely leisure to attend to the machinery by which they are conducted, or to examine the probability of the various events. In truth, many of these are highly improbable; but the reader who is interested in the narrative, will not stay to examine or interrupt his pleasure by a cool investigation of the means by which the consequences are produced.

ART. 29.—*Papa Brick; or, What is Death? &c. Being a Suite of Brick Bolding. 12mo. 3s. 6d. Boards. Law. 1804.*

*Alter et idem*, but not equally interesting, and far more improbable.

ART. 30.—*Sherwood Forest; or, Northern Adventures. A Novel, By Mrs. Villa Real Gouch. 3 Vols. 12mo. 12s. Boards. Lane, 1804.*

Sherwood Forest is the mere vehicle for adventures which have

but a very slight connexion with this celebrated spot. Yet it constitutes the native haunt of Mrs. Gouch, and has furnished her with some pleasing descriptions. In other views, the Northern Adventures do not greatly rise above the common herd of novels, and require no very particular remarks.

ART. 31.—*The Tears of Camphor; or, Love and Nature Triumphant. A Satirical Tale of the nineteenth Century; interspersed with original Poetry. By Henrico Fernandez Glysticus, LL. D; &c. 3 Vols. 12mo. 15s. Boards. Ginger. 1804.*

The author has made a late event the vehicle of his indecency and immorality. We are requested to judge of the whole, not of detached parts only, and, in consequence of the author's desire, we have read the whole; and after full consideration, can add, that the different parts are highly reprehensible, and the whole infamous.

ART. 32.—*The Reformed Reprobate: a Novel. 3 Vols. 12mo. 12s. Boards. Hughes. 1804.*

The author does not inform us to whom we are indebted for this little story; and it is only from a foreign journal, that we learn its author was Augustus La Fontaine. It is evidently of German extraction, and, on the whole, not uninteresting. Had German gloom permitted, it might have easily had a fortunate termination; and the personages would have been more interesting, had their offices been of English origin. Yet we would not, like a late writer, sink a churchwarden into a verger, because there is no such office as the former in a cathedral.

ART. 33.—*Modern Faults: a Novel, founded on Facts. By Mrs. Ker, Author of the Heiress of Montalde, &c. 2 Vols. 12mo. 6s. Boards. Badcock. 1804.*

Modern Faults! Faults? It is thus, as we have said, that crimes are extenuated by words. The true title is Modern Villanies; yet the villain repents; and the tale is not, on the whole, without its interest. A *real* fault is the prefixing such an unpleasing picture. Is it a likeness? It will not add to the value of the volume. Is it a caricature? The plate should have been destroyed, were it only in pity to those 'who are as ladies wish to be who love their lords.'

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

ART. 34.—*Two new Dialogues of the Dead. The first, between Handel and Braham. The second, between Johnson and Boswell. By J. B. 8vo. 1s. Johnson. 1804.*

The first of these dialogues is intended to cure Braham of his attachment to the trick of modern execution in singing. The object of the second we cannot discover, unless it be to depreciate the value of Boswell's Life of Johnson, which is impossible, or to tell that Boswell died of drinking, which was unnecessary, and not very respectful to the feelings of his children and other relatives. The style of the speakers in the first dialogue is not attempted; and in the second, it is attempted with very little success.



**ART. 35.**—*Home-brewed Ale; or plain practical Instructions to private Families, for brewing their own Liquor; with Directions concerning the Purchase and Size of Brewing-vessels, the Advantage of grinding their own Malt, and a Mode of preserving Yeast for future Use. By a Housekeeper. 8vo. 2s. Robinsons. 1804.*

This publication is introduced by the following advertisement—

‘ Although the process of brewing be very simple and easy, and although I have not, in these sheets, confined myself to my own single method, but have also detailed a variety of practices different from mine, and thus afforded to my reader a fair opportunity of choosing—I by no means desire that he should on that account reject, as useless, any one of the other publications on the same subject. They have been serviceable to me: so likewise may they prove serviceable to him: and indeed I never should have thought of adding to the number, if they had conveyed that preliminary information, so indispensably requisite to the housekeeper who is yet wholly unacquainted with the business, and unprovided with the necessary vessels; viz. what sizes will suit his intended brewing—what quantity he may brew where his room and conveniences are small—how material a distinction is to be made between measures of malt nominally the same, but sometimes widely different in reality, according as that article is purchased in the grain or ready ground—&c. &c. On these topics, and some others not usually noticed, I have endeavoured to give satisfactory explanations.

‘ The old housekeeper, I grant, who has long been accustomed to the routine of brewing, may think me tediously minute on many points which to him appear trifling, and which other writers in this department have deemed unworthy of attention. But they are *not* trifles to the novice, who *must* learn them, either from the communications of others, or from his own gradual and perhaps dear-bought experience: and it is chiefly for readers of the latter description that I have written this book—who, hearing that good ale is drunk in many private families at half the price of common porter, naturally wish to enjoy the same advantage themselves—but, not possessing any previous knowledge of the means, are at a loss how to proceed.—In short, a regard to the uninformed beginner was my sole motive for descending to so many petty minutiae, which might otherwise have been passed over in silence; though I venture to flatter myself, that, amid those remarks of inferior importance, even the experienced practitioner may find some useful hints which are altogether new.’ p. iii.

Among the novelties, we find the preservation of yeast dried in flour—a serpentine spirit-thermometer—improvements in the malt-mill—in the copper—a gauge for the copper—a coated strainer for the mash-tub—new-fashioned bungs, cocks, vents—&c. But, for particulars, we refer to the book itself; only observing, that, if this author’s calculations be accurate, there must be a prodigious and wanton waste of malt and hops in the families of country gentlemen who brew their own ale; and quoting, for the serious consideration of porter-drinkers, the following list of ingredients used by the common brewers;

\* Coccus Indicus—Copperas—Vitriolic acid—Alum—Salt of steel—Salt of tartar—Cream of tartar—Guinea pepper—Quassia—Gentian—Indian bark—Ginger—Orange pea—Bean-flour—Bitter bean—Calamus aromaticus—Caraway-seed—Coriander-seed—Grains of paradise—Bay-salt—Licorice-root—Licorice-juice—Sugar—Me-lasses—and Coloring.' p. 1.

ART. 36.—*New Farmer's Calendar, or Monthly Remembrancer for all Kinds of Country Business: comprehending all the material Improvements in the New Husbandry; with the Management of Live-Stock. Inscribed to the Farmers of Great Britain. By a Farmer and a Breeder. Fourth Edition. 8vo. 9s. Boards. Symonds. 1804.*

The editions of this work have strangely multiplied; for the first preface is dated in 1800, while the date to the fourth edition is 1802. We perceive nothing so striking and important in the work as to occasion this demand. The Calendar, to remind the farmer of the regular returns of husbandry business, may be useful; but it forms only a small part of the volume. The long preface to the fourth edition, and the greater part of the work, is on miscellaneous agricultural subjects, and of very unequal value. On the whole, it scarcely merits an analysis, or a quotation.

ART. 37.—*A concise History of the English Colony in New South Wales, from the Landing of Governor Phillip in January 1788, to May, 1803; describing also, the Dispositions, Habits, and savage Customs of the wandering unfortunate Natives of that antipodean Territory. With some cursory Remarks on the Treatment and Behaviour of the Convicts and Free Settlers. Also, correct Tables of Provisions, &c. allowed by Government to Settlers and Convicts on Board of Ship, and in the Colony; the Names, and Quantity of Land, granted to the first Free and Convict Settlers, Price of Wages, &c. 8vo. 2s. 6d. Harris.*

This is a short abstract of some of the more striking parts of colonel Collins's History, so far as respects the annals of the colony. Where the marks of quotation do not appear, we find nothing of importance added, except in the following passage. It is singular, that, in the interior of every country, a race of a peculiar kind are discovered, in appearance the remains of the first inhabitants. We have often pointed out such tribes, and trust that we may receive a fuller account of the 'Tree Climbers.'

'This tribe, called by the natives Bu-ru-be-zon-gal, and by the colonists Tree Climbers, inhabit the interior parts of the woods, and obtain their scanty miserable subsistence by the chase. This tribe do not speak the same language as the natives, who have visited the settlement: they preserve their teeth; wear in their hair the tails of several small animals; and do not look in the least like any of the other tribes.' p. 25.

ART. 38.—*The Beauties of England and Wales; or Delineations Historical, Topographical, and Descriptive, of each County. Embellished with Engravings by John Britton and Edward Wedlake Brayley. Vol. II. 8vo. 14s. Boards. Vernor and Hood.*

We introduced this work in our Second Series, Vol. 34., and then examined its object and design. The second volume is by no means

inferior to the former: the engravings, with a very few exceptions, are, we think, superior, and the compilation is, on the whole, more select and valuable. A few broken reeds our authors still rest on—they venture, 'like little wanton boys, that swim on bladders:' these must of course burst, and the system sink. We allude to the great confidence with which they repose on Mr. Polwhele and Mr. Whitaker. When, however, we spoke of compilation, we meant not to say that none of the descriptions are original. The authors seem, sometimes, to have copied from their own observations, though their extracts from the works of others are very numerous. The title, perhaps, chiefly refers to the plates; for the substance, we have observed, is rather archæological and descriptive.

The counties described in this volume are Cambridgeshire, Cheshire, and Cernawall; but we find nothing that we can, with advantage, transcribe. The whole is neatly and well compacted; in general, judicious and accurate. The frontispiece is a good representation of Thorney Abbey, Cambridgeshire, from a drawing by Nash; the vignette in the title-page exhibits a Cornish Cromlech, called Treve-thy Stone, from a drawing by Mr. Britton.

The other plates are not exclusively confined to the objects of the counties mentioned, and it is probable that the arrangement will be directed at the conclusion of the work. The other plates are twenty-four in number, from the drawings of Mr. Nash, Mr. Britton, sir Richard Hoare, Mr. Underwood, Mr. Dayes, Mr. Powel, Mr. Buckler, Mr. Varley, &c. They represent Wooburn Abbey, Bedfordshire; Coleshill House, Berkshire; Park Place, Berkshire; Wimpole, Cambridgeshire; King's College, Cambridge; Chester; Beeston Rock and Castle, Cheshire; Roach Rocks and Chapel, Cornwall; St. German's Church, Cornwall; Berry Pomeroy Castle, Devonshire; Derwent Water, Cumberland; two views, at different distances, of Powderham Castle, Devonshire, without the slightest resemblance either in the appearance of the Castle or the back ground; Durham; St. Botolph Priory, Essex; Tewkesbury Church, Gloucestershire; Gloucester Cathedral; Rumsey Church, Hampshire; Furness Abbey, Lancashire; Lincoln Cathedral, west front; Tynemouth Castle and Priory, Northumberland; Norwich; Radcliff Church, Bristol; Litchfield Cathedral, Staffordshire.

It is impossible to conjecture the extent of this work. It must necessarily be voluminous; but, if continued with the spirit and attention with which it has commenced, it will be truly valuable, as uniting antiquarian research, descriptive accounts, and picturesque beauties. We would advise, however, a greater degree of attention to the embellishments. The plates are, at present, very unequally executed. A good Index is subjoined.

ART. 39.—*An Historical Review of the Royal Marine Corps, from its original Institution, down to the present Era, 1803. By Alexander Gillespie, First Lieutenant, and upwards of twenty-four Years an Officer in it. 4to. 11. 1s. Boards. Egerton.*

We have examined, with pleasure, this grateful tribute to the services of the marine corps, of which the author has so long been a member. Their services, detailed in this volume with great

modesty and propriety, introduce a short account of some of the most brilliant actions which the British troops have performed both by sea and land; events which have in various forms claimed and received our applause. Again to fight the battle, 'again to slay the slain,' is now unnecessary.

The marine corps was originally raised as a supply to the body of seamen; and we still think that it might be rendered useful in that view. Draughts from the marines must be much more serviceable than landmen; and their place may be supplied by volunteers from the army, who, when the superior advantages of marine service are considered, will probably not be wanting. The first authentic instance of any regiment of this description occurs in 1684. The marines were placed on their present amphibious footing in the early part of the reign of queen Anne. The privileges of a marine soldier, and the indulgences granted him, are stated in the appendix.

This volume is illustrated, we can scarcely say adorned, by a view of St. Jean d'Acre, which is indifferently executed.

### CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. BELFOUR, in a polite letter we have received from him, has generally admitted the propriety of our strictures upon his Fables, imitated from Yriarte, though he contends that the absurdity which we pointed out in that of *the Bee and the Cuckoo*, of putting the moral into the mouth of the aggressor, and which we ascribed to himself alone, should be attributed to his original. It appears that his copy commences differently from ours. We have pointed out this difference already; and as the incongruity is avoided by adopting the reading as we transcribed it, it is a strong proof of its being the true lection. The replies are clearly ascertained, though the names of the speakers are not always introduced; and are as intelligible with this opening, as with that for which he contends. The means by which he was led into the error of sinking the talents of Dryden below those of Pitt, as in the following distich, to which we objected on more accounts than one—

'So, Dryden, when compared to Pitt,  
Is DULLNESS, *opposite to wit*'—

We leave Mr. Belfour to communicate in his own words.—

'The fact is, the distich, as it stands, was never designed to be published, but arose from the *fair copy* of the rough draft being sent to the printer *without due revision*. The lines so inaccurately transcribed were thus written by the author:

'So, when compared to Dryden, Pitt  
Is dullness, *opposite to wit*.'

We beg to decline the offer of our respectable Correspondent, CALEDONIUS PERTHENSIS. The work he alludes to will be noticed in our next Review.

We are requested to state, that a new edition of the translation of LONGUS's PASTORAL (noticed in the Review for May) will shortly be published.—The translator is the Rev. C. V. Le Grice.